

EXHIBIT B

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

DATACORE SOFTWARE CORPORATION,

Plaintiff,

v.

C.A. No.

SCALE COMPUTING, INC.,

22-535-GBW-SRF

Defendant.

VIDEOCONFERENCE HEARING

DATE: Wednesday, November 29, 2023

TIME: 12:11 p.m.

BEFORE: Honorable Sherry Fallon

LOCATION: J. Caleb Boggs Federal Building

844 North King Street

Unit 14, Room 6100

Wilmington, DE 19801

REPORTED BY: Andrew Weader

JOB NO.: 6322712

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 2</p> <p>1 APPEARANCES</p> <p>2 ON BEHALF OF PLAINTIFF DATACORE SOFTWARE CORPORATION:</p> <p>3 JODI BENASSI, ESQUIRE (by videoconference)</p> <p>4 ETHAN TOWNSEND, ESQUIRE (by videoconference)</p> <p>5 McDermott Will & Emery, LLP</p> <p>6 415 Mission Street, Suite 5600</p> <p>7 San Francisco, CA 94105</p> <p>8 jbenassi@mwe.com</p> <p>9 (628) 577-0107</p> <p>10</p> <p>11 ON BEHALF OF DEFENDANT SCALE COMPUTING, INC.:</p> <p>12 TALIN GORDINA, ESQUIRE (by videoconference)</p> <p>13 Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati, P.C.</p> <p>14 1900 Avenue of the Stars, 28th Floor</p> <p>15 Los Angeles, CA 90067</p> <p>16 (323) 210-2925</p> <p>17 (424) 446-6900</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 4</p> <p>1 EXHIBITS</p> <p>2 NO. DESCRIPTION ID/EVD</p> <p>3 Plaintiff:</p> <p>4 (None marked.)</p> <p>5</p> <p>6 NO. DESCRIPTION ID/EVD</p> <p>7 Defendant:</p> <p>8 (None marked.)</p> <p>9</p> <p>10</p> <p>11</p> <p>12</p> <p>13</p> <p>14</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 3</p> <p>1 APPEARANCES (Cont'd)</p> <p>2 ON BEHALF OF DEFENDANT SCALE COMPUTING, INC.:</p> <p>3 BINDU PALAPURA, ESQUIRE (by videoconference)</p> <p>4 Potter Anderson & Corroon, LLP</p> <p>5 Hercules Plaza</p> <p>6 1313 North Market Street, 6th Floor</p> <p>7 Wilmington, DE 19801</p> <p>8 bpalapura@potteranderson.com</p> <p>9 (302) 984-6000</p> <p>10</p> <p>11</p> <p>12</p> <p>13</p> <p>14</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 5</p> <p>1 PROCEEDINGS</p> <p>2 THE COURT: All right. This is the</p> <p>3 matter in Datacore vs. Scale. It's docket number</p> <p>4 22-535. It's the time that that the Court has set</p> <p>5 aside for a discovery dispute teleconference.</p> <p>6 Since we're off to a bit of a late</p> <p>7 start, Counsel will need to condense their arguments.</p> <p>8 I had set aside an hour for this teleconference, so I</p> <p>9 expect to be concluded by one so that I can attend to</p> <p>10 other matters on the Court calendar.</p> <p>11 With that, let's start with appearances</p> <p>12 of counsel. First, for the plaintiff, Datacore.</p> <p>13 MR. TOWNSEND: Good afternoon, Your</p> <p>14 Honor. This is Ethan Townsend from the Delaware</p> <p>15 office of McDermott Will & Emery on behalf of the</p> <p>16 plaintiff. With me on the line is my colleague from</p> <p>17 San Francisco, Jodi Benassi. Ms. Benassi will be</p> <p>18 presenting to the Court today with the Court's</p> <p>19 permission.</p> <p>20 THE COURT: Very well. Thank you.</p> <p>21 And who was on the line for Scale</p> <p>22 Computing? I know Ms. Palapura is. If you'd like to</p> <p>23 introduce the others on the line, you may do so now.</p> <p>24 MS. PALAPURA: Good afternoon, Your</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 6</p> <p>1 Honor. Bindu Palapura from Potter on behalf of 2 Defendant Scale. And with me today is Talin Gordina 3 from Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati. Ms. Gordina is 4 going to be handling the arguments this afternoon. 5 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you for that. 6 I have read the materials that have 7 been submitted and I am prepared to go forward. And I 8 think, Counsel, I think there were two issues that 9 have been resolved prior to today's conference. We'll 10 go forward, unless I hear otherwise that said other 11 issues have been resolved, we'll go forward with 12 Datacore's Motion to Compel -- 13 I'd like to start with the Motion for 14 Relief in the form of precluding Scale from relying on 15 documents produced after the document discovery 16 deadline of August 31. 17 And specifically, I'd like to hear from 18 Datacore how weighing the Pennypack factors tips in 19 favor of this substantial relief that Datacore is 20 seeking. 21 MS. BENASSI: Thank you, Your Honor. 22 This is Jodi Benassi from McDermott Will & Emery for 23 the plaintiff. 24 Your Honor, Scale has been operating on</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 8</p> <p>1 And also I want the date on which you 2 served your 30(b)(6) Deposition Notice on behalf of 3 Datacore. I didn't see the date mentioned and I 4 didn't look that closely at the docket to find it. 5 MS. BENASSI: Sure, Your Honor. I'd be 6 happy to provide that. The date that we provided the 7 Deposition Notice was on July 27, 2023. 8 And with respect to Scale's document 9 production for clarity, they produced 151,074 10 documents in productions between June 1 and the close 11 of fact discovery. So that was after the deadline for 12 substantial document completion and close of fact 13 discovery. Prior to June 1, they had produced 499 14 documents. After close of fact discovery on August 15 31st, they produced an additional 5,127 documents. 16 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. So your 17 30(b)(6) notice was issued in July, roughly a little 18 over a month before the close of fact discovery, is 19 that correct? 20 MS. BENASSI: That's correct. 21 THE COURT: And then the bulk of these 22 documents came in as of September 18th, albeit if a 23 portion, a significant portion of them, were untimely 24 in Datacore's view. Is that right?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 7</p> <p>1 its own discovery timeline in this case and has 2 completely ignored this Court's schedule and the 3 rules. They've made 12 document productions past the 4 deadlines in the scheduling order, and these 5 productions have represented over 99 percent of their 6 total documents produced in this case. 7 Datacore has been harmed by these 8 untimely productions. First, Datacore did not have an 9 opportunity to review and analyze the bulk of Scale's 10 documents before it served its 30(b)(6) Deposition 11 Notice on Scale. And second, Datacore was unable -- 12 THE COURT: Let me interrupt there. 13 And I'm sorry, I know it's difficult on these calls. 14 But I want to make sure I'm precisely understanding 15 your argument, because I'm hearing a different story 16 from Scale. I'm sure you've read their response. 17 When you say that this is 99 percent of 18 their production was belated, they're telling me that, 19 you know, slightly over 5,100 documents were produced, 20 I guess, between the document production deadline and 21 September 18. And then a few more came in in November 22 after I ruled on one of the prior discovery disputes. 23 You're telling me 99 percent of their document 24 production is a belated or late untimely production?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 9</p> <p>1 MS. BENASSI: That's correct. And just 2 to be clear again, the biggest production, which was 3 137,172 documents, which equated to 267,466 pages, 4 occurred on August 19, which was 10 days before the 5 close of fact discovery. No other production had been 6 near that size. And then it was in September that 7 we -- 8 THE COURT: So let me stop you there. 9 Maybe easier to get through since we have limited time 10 on this call. So you nonetheless had, I'll call it, a 11 document dump for purposes of our discussion, in 12 August, like, 10 days or so before the close of fact 13 discovery. And at that time, the 30(b)(6) Deposition 14 Notice had already issued, correct? 15 MS. BENASSI: That's correct. 16 THE COURT: And adjustments had to be 17 made in light of wrapping in those documents that were 18 produced on the eve of fact discovery closing if they 19 were going to be useful in this 30(b)(6) deposition 20 and/or other fact witness depositions. Is that right? 21 MS. BENASSI: That's right, Your Honor. 22 And we had at the time all of Scale's 30(b)(6) 23 depositions scheduled to happen in September, so we 24 were scrambling.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 10</p> <p>1 THE COURT: Then the parties did make</p> <p>2 adjustments to push them out to November. And it's my</p> <p>3 understanding one of the reasons it was pushed out by</p> <p>4 two months at that time was because Datacore's legal</p> <p>5 team had other unrelated matters and/or trials that it</p> <p>6 was preoccupied with and could not push these</p> <p>7 depositions out by just a month. Is that right?</p> <p>8 MS. BENASSI: That's correct. But I'll</p> <p>9 point out a nuance to that. In August and through the</p> <p>10 beginning of September, the parties were moving</p> <p>11 forward with us taking Scale's 30(b)(6) depositions in</p> <p>12 September. And so we were working through those</p> <p>13 documents as quickly as we could.</p> <p>14 And then the two subsequent productions</p> <p>15 happened without any warning at all. And you know,</p> <p>16 that was almost 30,000 documents that got produced.</p> <p>17 Actually, it was over 30,000.</p> <p>18 And so it wasn't until after September</p> <p>19 18th that we had asked Scale for second depositions of</p> <p>20 their witnesses, and they refused. And we had no</p> <p>21 alternative at that point but to agree to move the</p> <p>22 depositions to November.</p> <p>23 And you're correct, through the month</p> <p>24 of October, Datacore's lead counsel in the case was at</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 12</p> <p>1 the other witnesses since the time that the</p> <p>2 depositions were taken earlier in the month and has</p> <p>3 had the ability to go through those, except for this</p> <p>4 one that's being taken tomorrow, correct?</p> <p>5 MS. BENASSI: He has copies. Our</p> <p>6 experts have copies of all of the transcripts,</p> <p>7 correct.</p> <p>8 THE COURT: And there's nothing</p> <p>9 specific in your letter briefing, unless I've</p> <p>10 overlooked it. And if I have, please feel free to</p> <p>11 correct me. I don't presume to have all of these</p> <p>12 arguments in every line in the letter briefing</p> <p>13 committed to memory. But I didn't see anything in the</p> <p>14 letter briefing about how your expert is hindered in</p> <p>15 any way shape or form from producing an opening report</p> <p>16 within the deadline set currently by this current</p> <p>17 scheduling order.</p> <p>18 MS. BENASSI: Well, Your Honor, one of</p> <p>19 the issues is Datacore has not had the time to analyze</p> <p>20 the over 5,000 documents that have been produced by</p> <p>21 Scale after the close of fact discovery. So we don't</p> <p>22 know the extent of what's in those documents. So that</p> <p>23 has severely prejudiced Datacore.</p> <p>24 And then in turn, the fact that we</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 11</p> <p>1 trial in another matter.</p> <p>2 And so all of the depositions in this</p> <p>3 case have happened in November, which has further</p> <p>4 prejudiced Datacore's expert's ability to write their</p> <p>5 expert reports, which are due next Friday.</p> <p>6 So our last deposition is happening</p> <p>7 tomorrow, and then there's eight days until our expert</p> <p>8 reports are due. And having everything happening in</p> <p>9 November has really prejudiced Datacore.</p> <p>10 THE COURT: Well, after reviewing the</p> <p>11 documents, you didn't go back and amend your 30(b)(6)</p> <p>12 Deposition Notice before proceeding with the bulk of</p> <p>13 these fact depositions in November, correct?</p> <p>14 MS. BENASSI: Correct.</p> <p>15 THE COURT: You have essentially taken</p> <p>16 all the depositions, all the fact depositions that</p> <p>17 needed to be taken within this timeframe except for</p> <p>18 one. There's one final one that you say is going</p> <p>19 forward did you say tomorrow, is that right?</p> <p>20 MS. BENASSI: That's correct, Your</p> <p>21 Honor. There's an additional fact witness who's being</p> <p>22 deposed tomorrow.</p> <p>23 THE COURT: All right. So your expert</p> <p>24 theoretically then has all these transcripts of all</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 13</p> <p>1 haven't had a chance to review all of those documents</p> <p>2 prejudices Datacore's experts.</p> <p>3 THE COURT: Yeah, but you're not</p> <p>4 showing -- I mean, you're making an argument in</p> <p>5 conclusory terms that there's prejudice, but you're</p> <p>6 not showing me how. The parties have adjusted.</p> <p>7 And let me preface this by saying, you</p> <p>8 know, and I'll discuss this with Scale, that the Court</p> <p>9 disfavors document dumps that are made either on the</p> <p>10 eve of discovery closing or belatedly shortly</p> <p>11 thereafter. That is not the way discovery should be</p> <p>12 handled in the case.</p> <p>13 Nonetheless, when looking at the</p> <p>14 Pennypack factors, it's not a black and white all or</p> <p>15 nothing result. It doesn't automatically result in a</p> <p>16 preclusion. The document dump is only one part of the</p> <p>17 analysis. In analyzing prejudice, prejudice has to be</p> <p>18 shown.</p> <p>19 I need to see just exactly where the</p> <p>20 prejudice is and how mitigating or attempting to cure</p> <p>21 that prejudice is going to have a domino effect in</p> <p>22 terms of upending the rest of the case, in terms of</p> <p>23 the schedule and going forward with it.</p> <p>24 And that's not in this letter briefing</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 14</p> <p>1 record unless I'm missing it. Can you show me where 2 that is?</p> <p>3 MS. BENASSI: Not at the moment. But 4 what I can say in terms of prejudice that I think is 5 throughout the letter brief is that we, Datacore, has 6 not had an opportunity to analyze the 5,100 documents. 7 And because of that, we weren't able to ask Scale's 8 witnesses questions about those 5,100 documents. 9 I mean, there's certain documents we 10 were able to get to, but we couldn't get through 11 everything. And that's the prejudice here. 12 THE COURT: You've had 5,100 documents, 13 as I understand it, since September 18th, well over 14 two months now. Am I mistaken? 15 MS. BENASSI: No, you're correct in 16 terms of the timing, but it's the nuances, what's 17 happened in terms of the timing. 18 So in the month of September, we were 19 ramped up in August with the full discovery team to 20 review documents and getting ready for depositions in 21 September. That team wound down. 22 And so we're in the middle of preparing 23 for all of these depositions, preparing our witnesses, 24 preparing deposition outlines, and then we get two</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 16</p> <p>1 We think we'll have time to go through 2 and identify any issues in the documents. And I think 3 potentially we could take a deposition before the 4 rebuttal report. That might be possible. 5 THE COURT: What deposition are you 6 envisioning taking before the rebuttal expert report? 7 MS. BENASSI: We don't know because we 8 don't know what's in the documents. 9 THE COURT: All right. Well, that 10 explains the -- and I think I don't need to ask my 11 next question. Which is, what is the scope, topics, 12 timeframe, and amount of time needed for this related 13 relief of seeking an additional 30(b)(6) deposition? 14 You're not in a position I'm assuming to respond to 15 that inquiry? 16 MS. BENASSI: That's correct, Your 17 Honor. 18 THE COURT: All right. Anything 19 further before I hear from Scale on this issue? 20 MS. BENASSI: I would -- no, given the 21 time, I'll rest on that. 22 THE COURT: Very well. Thank you. 23 Ms. Gordina, I'll hear from you on 24 behalf of Scale.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 15</p> <p>1 additional document productions. 2 We didn't have time to turn to those 3 documents and fully analyze them by the time we were 4 getting ready for the 30(b)(6) depositions that were 5 happening in September. 6 Then in October, the core team left, 7 went off to another trial and didn't come back until 8 November. By the time November hit, it was 9 back-to-back depositions. Every single day 10 practically in the month of November has been a 11 deposition. 12 So either we're taking a deposition or 13 we've been preparing our witnesses for depositions, 14 there's been zero time to go back and review the 15 documents. 16 THE COURT: Have you thought about some 17 interim remedy short of precluding the use of these 18 documents throughout the remainder of the litigation? 19 MS. BENASSI: We have, Your Honor. We 20 thought about that in advance of today's hearing. And 21 you know, we think, you know, if we were given until, 22 let's say, you know, a week or so after the rebuttal 23 reports. And our rebuttal reports right now are due 24 on January 15th, maybe a week or two before that.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 17</p> <p>1 MS. GORDINA: Good afternoon, Your 2 Honor. Thank you for the opportunity. 3 Your Honor, you focused in on the key 4 issue here, which is the prejudice. There is none, 5 because as the record reflects, these 5,000 or so 6 documents have been in the possession of Datacore for 7 over two months. 8 And based on their own representations 9 to us about the contents of those documents, it seemed 10 to us that they had reviewed them, and they asked 11 questions about those documents of our witnesses at 12 their depositions in November. 13 So Ms. Benassi's representation that 14 they have not reviewed those 5,000 documents in the 15 last two, two plus months, it's surprising because it 16 contradicts what the record shows to us. 17 We are not prepared to discuss another 18 30(b)(6) deposition after the rebuttal report. This 19 is the first time Datacore's Counsel has raised that 20 issue. So we have not met and conferred about that. 21 But it's difficult to see how that would remedy 22 anything here when there is no prejudice. 23 It's important to also understand what 24 those documents are. In the course of preparing our</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 18</p> <p>1 witnesses for their depositions, we identified these 2 documents that had been withheld because of privilege. 3 We realized that they were inadvertently withheld. We 4 had our reviewers look through them again and we 5 believed that the right thing to do was to produce 6 them as soon as we understood that they had been 7 inadvertently withheld. So we produced them within 8 about two weeks of the close of fact discovery. 9 Ms. Benassi failed to mention that 10 Datacore produced 90 percent of their documents within 11 the last 10 days of the fact discovery period. By the 12 June 1st substantial completion deadline, Datacore had 13 produced less than 70 documents. 14 So the discussion of what occurred 15 prior to the close of fact discovery, that seems a 16 little bit of a unrelated or tangential discussion 17 here, that I think the focus really needs to be on 18 these 5,000 documents. A few hundred of which were 19 documents that Datacore already had. These were 20 emails between the parties. 21 So as you said, it's hard to see where 22 there is any prejudice when Datacore has had these 23 documents for over two months, has reviewed them, and 24 has even questioned our witnesses about those</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20</p> <p>1 Did you give them any assistance with 2 that in terms of what you were producing, why you were 3 producing it late, how you were producing it, maybe on 4 a rolling basis to ease the burden of going through 5 it? Can you tell me what you did to assist them in 6 light of the fact that you're dumping 5,100 documents 7 on them at a very inopportune time in the litigation? 8 MS. GORDINA: Your Honor, we did do it 9 on a rolling basis. There were two productions, one 10 on September 13th and one on September 18th. 11 In terms of a notification, my 12 understanding there was no email notifying them that 13 this was coming. As soon as we realized what had 14 happened, we were busy reviewing the documents, making 15 sure that our vendor was getting them ready for 16 production. So the answer is we didn't provide them 17 any notice, but the production was made on a rolling 18 basis. Half of it came on the 13th and about just 19 over half of it on the 18th. 20 In terms of the -- well, I'll stop 21 there. I just wanted to answer your question. 22 THE COURT: All right. And in terms of 23 the interim relief that they suggested, that once 24 they're fully able to absorb and review all of these</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 19</p> <p>1 documents at their deposition. 2 So the extreme sanction of excluding 3 these documents, we don't see how that can be 4 warranted by the balancing of the Pennypack factors 5 when there's clearly no prejudice to Datacore. 6 I'll stop there, Your Honor, and see if 7 you have any questions just in interest of time. 8 THE COURT: Thank you, but I don't have 9 anything additional at this time. 10 Except that, well, let me just ask. 11 You said of those 5,100 or so documents that were 12 produced, and they were produced late because some of 13 them were thought to be privileged, you know, I guess 14 I'm finding it difficult to understand that. I mean, 15 the parties have been in this litigation for some 16 time. And I'm sure your team is well aware, not just 17 in this litigation, but in all cases like this, 18 similar to this, the Court disfavors document dumps. 19 How were these produced? Were they 20 produced all at once, were they produced on a rolling 21 basis? Did you have any discussion giving Datacore a 22 heads up that these were coming and to assist them 23 with the rather large task of going through what is 24 essentially a document dump at an inopportune time?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 21</p> <p>1 documents, and if it is determined that it would be 2 helpful to have an additional 30(b)(6) deposition, and 3 they propose doing it before rebuttal expert reports 4 are due, what is Scale's position on that other 5 alternative form of relief? 6 MS. GORDINA: Well, Your Honor, again, 7 it's the first time we're hearing this, and we don't 8 have enough details about what Datacore is 9 contemplating in terms of who the witnesses are or 10 what the questioning will be. 11 I think the problem there is having a 12 deposition in the middle of expert reports can sort of 13 upend the schedule as well. It may have impacts on 14 previously served expert reports. 15 So it's hard to imagine what that will 16 look like without knowing more, about specifically 17 what Datacore is hoping to get out of that deposition 18 that they have not already gotten out of. They've 19 deposed 10 Scale witnesses by the end of this month. 20 And so it's unclear what in those 5,000 documents they 21 believe they still need to question our witnesses on. 22 As we mentioned in our opposition 23 letter, they have actually asked questions of our 24 30(b)(6) witnesses about those documents. And it's,</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 22</p> <p>1 again, what I'm hearing Ms. Benassi say today is 2 contradicted by the record. The fact that they 3 allegedly haven't reviewed the documents is 4 contradicted by the fact that they've questioned our 5 witnesses about those documents. 6 So unfortunately, I don't have enough 7 information from Ms. Benassi about the remedy she's 8 seeking to be able to intelligently comment on it at 9 this time. 10 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 11 Anything further before I hear final words from 12 Datacore on this issue? 13 MS. GORDINA: No, Your Honor. 14 THE COURT: All right. Ms. Benassi? 15 MS. BENASSI: Thank you, Your Honor. 16 First, just to clear the record, I had previously said 17 that we had not reviewed all of the 5,100 documents. 18 There are some that we were able to review and 19 question witnesses on, but we have not been able to 20 review all of them. 21 Second, and importantly, the argument 22 about privileged documents is the first time in the 23 letter that Scale has made such an argument, and it's 24 implausible for three reasons.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24</p> <p>1 factors do not weigh in favor of that extreme relief, 2 and that Datacore on this record has not carried its 3 burden of showing that the Pennypack factors weigh in 4 favor of relief. 5 As I said earlier on the call, the 6 Court certainly disfavors document dumps on the eve of 7 a discovery cut off or belatedly afterwards. But the 8 remedies in each case are case specific, and Datacore 9 hasn't carried its burden of demonstrating that the 10 extreme relief of precluding the documents from being 11 utilized is warranted here, and has in fact indicated 12 that, you know, an interim remedy might be 13 appropriate. 14 But again, the Court is not in a 15 position to grant the interim remedy, because the 16 contours of that have not been developed. And 17 Datacore needs to complete its review of those 18 documents. 19 You've had them in hand now since 20 mid-September. And I recognize, and I'm not faulting 21 the plaintiff for not getting through them as 22 expeditiously as perhaps, you know, you'd hope to 23 given the press of other matters. 24 But that's the nature of litigation.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 23</p> <p>1 First, during the parties' meet and 2 confer on October 26th, we asked Scale why they 3 produce such a large volume of documents after fact 4 discovery closed, and Scale stated that they went back 5 to look for more information and realized that there 6 were more documents to produce. There was no 7 information about privilege. We also asked them why 8 they didn't give us a heads up, and they did not 9 really provide us with an answer to that. 10 Second, when we looked at the documents 11 at a high level, many of those document appear to be 12 industry publications and advertisements and press 13 releases that are clearly not privileged. 14 And third, Scale has not stated that it 15 withheld any documents on the basis of privilege. So 16 none of the 5,122 documents were identified as 17 privileged. And that's -- yeah, thank you. 18 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Well, we 19 need to move on to the other issues. 20 On this issue, the Court denies the 21 Motion to Compel the extreme relief of precluding 22 Scale from relying on documents produced after the 23 August 31, 2023, discovery cut off. 24 In summary, I find that the Pennypack</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 25</p> <p>1 Litigation teams are spread thin, they're spread thin 2 with this case, with other non-related cases. But 3 that's the nature of all litigation. And the effort 4 here should be on getting through that document 5 production and coming back to the Court if needed to 6 seek additional relief that is specifically contoured 7 around the documents produced in that belated 8 production. 9 In other words, after Datacore gets 10 through these documents, if it feels that there's a 11 necessity to seek another 30(b)(6) deposition of one 12 of Scale's witnesses, that's not a free pass to, you 13 know, button up all loose ends that exist at that 14 time. You know, the relief has to be tailored to the 15 problem. The problem here is a belated document dump 16 after the August 31 cut off. So the relief has to be 17 tailored to that. 18 If you're going to seek another 19 30(b)(6) witness, and I'm not saying on this record 20 that the Court would grant it, because at this point, 21 I know nothing about what the scope of that is, what 22 the topics are, what the length, how many hours might 23 be needed with that witness, and within what time 24 range it could be accomplished so as not to disrupt</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 26</p> <p>1 the balance of the crawl [ph] schedule.</p> <p>2 So I'm not saying I would grant that</p> <p>3 release if it was requested. I'm just saying it's</p> <p>4 without prejudice to Datacore to seek further relief.</p> <p>5 But it's got to be tethered to the specific documents</p> <p>6 that came belatedly after the August 31 cut off and is</p> <p>7 not free rein to tie up all loose ends generally in</p> <p>8 the case. It's not another shot at another deposition</p> <p>9 that's all encompassing. So let me be clear on that.</p> <p>10 With that, I am ready to move on to</p> <p>11 Datacore's next topic, which is the Motion to Compel</p> <p>12 Production of Relevant Design and Development</p> <p>13 Documents. I guess I dealt with a similar issue</p> <p>14 previously. We did not have a teleconference, but I</p> <p>15 disposed of it on the papers by oral order. And</p> <p>16 apparently this issue still lingers.</p> <p>17 So let me hear from Datacore on</p> <p>18 compelling production of relevant design and</p> <p>19 development documents.</p> <p>20 MS. BENASSI: Thank you, Your Honor.</p> <p>21 The issue here is the design and development documents</p> <p>22 relating to the accused products. This is a patent</p> <p>23 case, and they have just simply not provided</p> <p>24 sufficient documents in discovery.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 28</p> <p>1 testimony that [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>7 How do you respond to that argument?</p> <p>8 MS. BENASSI: Sure. Well,</p> <p>9 Mr. Loughmiller did testify that there are requirement</p> <p>10 documents in the code. And we've repeatedly asked for</p> <p>11 those documents.</p> <p>12 And the source code, for example, our</p> <p>13 expert went out to review the source code, but he</p> <p>14 didn't even have sufficient information from the</p> <p>15 documentation that Scale produced to perform any</p> <p>16 meaningful review of Scale's software. He inspected</p> <p>17 the source code for documents that Scale had told us</p> <p>18 were on the machine, and he wasn't able to locate</p> <p>19 them.</p> <p>20 And here we have Mr. Loughmiller</p> <p>21 stating that there's documents again in the code, but</p> <p>22 we have not seen those.</p> <p>23 THE COURT: Well, to the extent</p> <p>24 Mr. Alexander didn't find those documents at the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 27</p> <p>1 Our expert stated as part of our letter</p> <p>2 brief that she has not found design and development</p> <p>3 documents to inform him as an engineer how to</p> <p>4 understand the software. The documents that Scale</p> <p>5 produced are written for users, and design documents</p> <p>6 are written for engineers and provide details about</p> <p>7 how the software actually functions.</p> <p>8 During our deposition of</p> <p>9 Mr. Loughmiller, he testified that there are</p> <p>10 requirement documents in the code. Several of Scale's</p> <p>11 witnesses have testified that the company's documents</p> <p>12 are maintained in Salesforce. So we don't think it</p> <p>13 should be difficult for Scale to find and produce</p> <p>14 these documents.</p> <p>15 Mr. Hsieh also testified that there</p> <p>16 might be design documents, but he didn't know where</p> <p>17 they would be. He also referred to another person as</p> <p>18 the main designer of the Scribe product. So he may</p> <p>19 not be the right person to know where these documents</p> <p>20 would be located.</p> <p>21 THE COURT: Okay. A couple of</p> <p>22 questions before I hear from Scale. Scale points out</p> <p>23 that, I guess perhaps you're misinterpreting or</p> <p>24 reading too much into Mr. Loughmiller's deposition</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 29</p> <p>1 source code review he attended, it was my</p> <p>2 understanding that if they were missing, that Scale</p> <p>3 subsequently put them on the computer. But</p> <p>4 Mr. Alexander, your expert, never went back and looked</p> <p>5 at them. Is that the case?</p> <p>6 MS. BENASSI: No. It was actually a</p> <p>7 different piece of software. So there's three pieces</p> <p>8 of software that are at issue in the litigation. And</p> <p>9 when Mr. Alexander went to their office the first</p> <p>10 time, only one of the three pieces of software source</p> <p>11 code was on the machine. And then they</p> <p>12 stopped -- put --</p> <p>13 THE COURT: That's Scribe, and they put</p> <p>14 HyperCore and Fleet Manager on it, is that --</p> <p>15 MS. BENASSI: That's right, Your Honor.</p> <p>16 THE COURT: Okay. But they then put</p> <p>17 those two additional accused product software on the</p> <p>18 source code computer, and your expert didn't go back</p> <p>19 and look at that. That's what I'm trying to ferret</p> <p>20 out here.</p> <p>21 MS. BENASSI: Yeah. No, that's right.</p> <p>22 He did not go back because he needed to have the</p> <p>23 documentation to understand how the source code was</p> <p>24 structured to have a meaningful review of the source</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 30</p> <p>1 code. And he never --</p> <p>2 THE COURT: [REDACTED]</p> <p>3 [REDACTED] It's, you</p> <p>4 know, not just Mr. Loughmiller, but I guess the Scale</p> <p>5 senior architect, you pronounce his name Hank Hsieh if</p> <p>6 I understand, testified that the team would discuss a</p> <p>7 plan and then break out individually to code</p> <p>8 components.</p> <p>9 So there was no one specific person</p> <p>10 tasked with documenting the design and development</p> <p>11 process. The, you know, the developers, the writers</p> <p>12 and code writers or wherever each had a component part</p> <p>13 that they were coming up with. And while you're</p> <p>14 looking for something that's neatly packaged up as</p> <p>15 design and development, [REDACTED] from what</p> <p>16 I'm hearing from Scale. And my description of it is</p> <p>17 certainly less sophisticated and scientific than I'm</p> <p>18 sure I'll hear from them when they get the floor.</p> <p>19 But it's my understanding very</p> <p>20 generally and simplistically that the form and format</p> <p>21 of what you're looking for [REDACTED] And that's</p> <p>22 not your understanding on behalf of Datacore?</p> <p>23 MS. BENASSI: That's correct, Your</p> <p>24 Honor. And I would only point out that during</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 32</p> <p>1 [REDACTED]</p> <p>2 Is there anything further that you can</p> <p>3 point to that you believe supports the fact that [REDACTED]</p> <p>4 [REDACTED]</p> <p>5 MS. BENASSI: The last thing I would</p> <p>6 point to, Your Honor, is the temporal limitation. We</p> <p>7 had asked Scale if they had gone back and looked for</p> <p>8 documents around the time the product was designed,</p> <p>9 which is in 2012. This is a patent case, and the</p> <p>10 patent in this case was filed in 2002, and the accused</p> <p>11 products were designed around 2012.</p> <p>12 And they produced a couple of</p> <p>13 additional documents, but then noted the default</p> <p>14 standard limiting discovery to the past six years.</p> <p>15 And I just want to point out that even</p> <p>16 if the default standard limits discovery to the past</p> <p>17 six years, Scale's using it as a sword and a shield.</p> <p>18 They've asked Datacore for its complete set of</p> <p>19 financials from 1998. And we've agreed to produce</p> <p>20 those. Where here on the other hand, they state to us</p> <p>21 that they don't need to produce documents past six</p> <p>22 years.</p> <p>23 So I don't know if the review and</p> <p>24 looking and investigation into design documents was</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 31</p> <p>1 Mr. Hsieh's deposition, I asked him, do you keep</p> <p>2 design documents related to Scribe? And his response</p> <p>3 was, I don't know where they would be, but I believe</p> <p>4 there might be some out there, because there's been</p> <p>5 talks in the past and I don't know where those would</p> <p>6 be.</p> <p>7 And I asked him if he had seen those</p> <p>8 documents, and he said he just remembered talks, but</p> <p>9 he believed that there were documents. So there's a</p> <p>10 bit of contradiction in his testimony.</p> <p>11 THE COURT: Well, he doesn't remember</p> <p>12 documents, he remembers talks, which is essentially</p> <p>13 what Scale has argued in their response, that reason</p> <p>14 exists. I mean, things were done, I guess [REDACTED]</p> <p>15 [REDACTED]</p> <p>16 [REDACTED], but that's kind of where we are now. [REDACTED]</p> <p>17 [REDACTED]</p> <p>18 [REDACTED]</p> <p>19 But what you're describing from</p> <p>20 Mr. Hsieh's testimony doesn't confirm that [REDACTED]</p> <p>21 [REDACTED]</p> <p>22 [REDACTED]</p> <p>23 [REDACTED]</p> <p>24 [REDACTED]</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 33</p> <p>1 limited by Scale to 2016 or if they truly went back to</p> <p>2 see if there were designed documents around the time</p> <p>3 the accused products would have actually been</p> <p>4 designed.</p> <p>5 THE COURT: Well, the default standard</p> <p>6 is there for a reason, and it's not set aside just</p> <p>7 because a party wants it in discovery. There's a good</p> <p>8 cause standard. What's the good cause for making them</p> <p>9 search for documents beyond the six years in the</p> <p>10 default standard?</p> <p>11 MS. BENASSI: Well, again, Your Honor,</p> <p>12 it's a patent case and the accused products were</p> <p>13 designed in 2012, and the patent was filed in 2002.</p> <p>14 And the design of the document is important for</p> <p>15 Datacore to be able to fully analyze its infringement</p> <p>16 contentions and claims.</p> <p>17 THE COURT: If that were the standard</p> <p>18 for good cause, then there would be no need for a</p> <p>19 six-year limit limitation in the default standard,</p> <p>20 because the same could be said in every patent case.</p> <p>21 So is there anything further that you can point to for</p> <p>22 good cause?</p> <p>23 MS. BENASSI: Not right now, Your</p> <p>24 Honor.</p>

<p>Page 34</p> <p>1 THE COURT: All right. Thank you.</p> <p>2 I'll hear from Scale on this issue.</p> <p>3 And Scale, can you specifically address</p> <p>4 an argument that was made in Datacore's brief, but I</p> <p>5 didn't really see you hit it on the head directly in</p> <p>6 the responsive letter briefing. And that is that</p> <p>7 Datacore argues that responsive documents reside in</p> <p>8 Scale's Salesforce database, and Datacore wants the</p> <p>9 responsive documents specifically related to Scribe,</p> <p>10 HyperCore, Fleet Manager, HC3 System, and FC Platform,</p> <p>11 which are needed for its experts to analyze</p> <p>12 infringement. I need a response directly to that,</p> <p>13 please.</p> <p>14 MS. GORDINA: Your Honor, with respect</p> <p>15 to Salesforce, that is a sales tool, not a repository</p> <p>16 for design documents. So I think there's a bit of a</p> <p>17 misunderstanding on Datacore's part about what</p> <p>18 Salesforce is used for. It's a tool where sales</p> <p>19 people track potential sales opportunities.</p> <p>20 So if they start talking to a customer,</p> <p>21 a potential customer, they document their interactions</p> <p>22 with that customer. If the customer ends up</p> <p>23 purchasing something from Scale's product offerings,</p> <p>24 then that gets documented. So it's not a repository</p>	<p>Page 35</p> <p>1 for design documents. So --</p> <p>2 THE COURT: But it -- has documents</p> <p>3 that, you know, that's not its main function, but</p> <p>4 there may be design documents in there if the</p> <p>5 Salesforce needs to highlight the properties or</p> <p>6 attributes of the software or whatever. Has it even</p> <p>7 been searched? I guess more importantly before, you</p> <p>8 know, all of us here speculating as to what might be</p> <p>9 found there, has it been searched?</p> <p>10 MS. GORDINA: The Sales -- so we have</p> <p>11 not run an ESI search term search against Salesforce.</p> <p>12 I'm not even sure if that's technically possible. But</p> <p>13 to the extent there are any documents in Salesforce,</p> <p>14 for example, a salesperson sends a brochure to a</p> <p>15 customer, a customer wouldn't be privy to confidential</p> <p>16 design documents if they were to exist.</p> <p>17 So the types of documents Salesforce</p> <p>18 would potentially have within it would be the same</p> <p>19 types of documents that we've already produced.</p> <p>20 There's no shortage of documents in our production</p> <p>21 about how the product operates, customer-facing</p> <p>22 documentation, brochures, manuals, theory of operation</p> <p>23 documents, white papers. We've produced all of that.</p> <p>24 There's nothing on the design side that</p>	<p>Page 36</p> <p>1 we're withholding. We've gone back to our client</p> <p>2 numerous times at the request of Datacore to ask yet</p> <p>3 again, is there anything else? Is there anything</p> <p>4 else? We haven't limited to 2016 or any particular</p> <p>5 date. We've repeatedly asked and produced everything</p> <p>6 we could produce. I'm not sure what more Datacore's</p> <p>7 hoping that we can provide [REDACTED]</p> <p>8 [REDACTED]</p> <p>9 And I'll just point out, Mr. Alexander</p> <p>10 spent less than a day looking at the code. And he</p> <p>11 never returned after we supplemented the source code</p> <p>12 computer. In over 10 years of patent litigation, I've</p> <p>13 never seen a source code reviewer spend less than a</p> <p>14 day on a code review and say, I don't understand it.</p> <p>15 So it's a little surprising that Mr. Alexander has</p> <p>16 concluded he doesn't understand the code when he spent</p> <p>17 such little time on it.</p> <p>18 But again, we're very short on time, so</p> <p>19 I'll stop there. I just want to make sure I answer</p> <p>20 your questions, Your Honor.</p> <p>21 THE COURT: Thank you. What</p> <p>22 exactly -- how was the source code supplemented? What</p> <p>23 was missing during the review and what did Scale do to</p> <p>24 remedy it?</p>	<p>Page 37</p> <p>1 MS. GORDINA: Well, the Fleet Manager</p> <p>2 code was added. So Fleet Manager was added for the</p> <p>3 first time in Datacore's final infringement</p> <p>4 contentions. They -- they added it as an accused</p> <p>5 product. And when Mr. Alexander reviewed the code, I</p> <p>6 believe the one time he reviewed the code, the fleet</p> <p>7 manager code wasn't on the laptop yet, and we added it</p> <p>8 within days.</p> <p>9 But I don't think that's what Datacore</p> <p>10 is really taking issue with. I think their motion</p> <p>11 isn't really about -- well, I'll just stop there.</p> <p>12 I'll answer your questions since we're so short on</p> <p>13 time.</p> <p>14 THE COURT: All right. Thank you.</p> <p>15 Anything further, Ms. Benassi?</p> <p>16 MS. BENASSI: I would just state that</p> <p>17 there were multiple Scale witnesses that testified</p> <p>18 that documents are stored in Salesforce.</p> <p>19 THE COURT: Understood, but the type of</p> <p>20 documents are what's likely been produced, which is</p> <p>21 what Datacore is complaining about. These are all</p> <p>22 customer-facing documents, user -- end-user documents,</p> <p>23 which would make sense to store in a sales marketing</p> <p>24 database.</p>
--	---	--	--

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 38</p> <p>1 And at this point, well after the</p> <p>2 deadline for fact discovery, I'd need a little more of</p> <p>3 a showing of good cause and a reasonable basis for</p> <p>4 forcing Scale to go back and do search terms against</p> <p>5 that database, if it's even possible.</p> <p>6 Anything further on that point to</p> <p>7 persuade me otherwise?</p> <p>8 MS. BENASSI: No, nothing further, Your</p> <p>9 Honor.</p> <p>10 THE COURT: All right. I'm going to</p> <p>11 deny without prejudice the Motion to Compel Production</p> <p>12 of Relevant Design and Development Documents. I'm</p> <p>13 satisfied based upon Scale's response to this that it</p> <p>14 has done and -- it has looked for, gathered, and</p> <p>15 produced everything that is responsive to that</p> <p>16 category of documents, and that the documents, the</p> <p>17 sort of design and development documents that Datacore</p> <p>18 seeks, [REDACTED]</p> <p>19 I have found that also that there is no</p> <p>20 good cause, at least on the record made on this call,</p> <p>21 to compel Scale to go back beyond the six-year</p> <p>22 limitation in the default standard for discovery and</p> <p>23 continue to look for such documents based upon the</p> <p>24 excerpts of the transcripts of the witnesses</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 40</p> <p>1 First, I understand and I have seen listed the</p> <p>2 replacement custodians that Scale is seeking in this</p> <p>3 case, Alexander Best, Amit Baranwal, Abhijit Dey,</p> <p>4 David Zabrowski, and Kevin Thimble.</p> <p>5 First, let me ask a question about one</p> <p>6 that I call the easy one, Mr. or Ms. Dey, D-E-Y. That</p> <p>7 seems to be an individual who's not connected in any</p> <p>8 way with the accused or with the SANsymphony product</p> <p>9 that's at issue and I guess surrounds part -- is part</p> <p>10 of the issue that drives this request. Why are you</p> <p>11 looking for custodial information from that individual</p> <p>12 if he's got nothing to do with the SANsymphony</p> <p>13 product?</p> <p>14 MS. GORDINA: So Your Honor, Mr. Dey</p> <p>15 was identified based on documentation we saw,</p> <p>16 specifically an email with a Mr. Bassett who is an</p> <p>17 identified witness on the paragraph three disclosures</p> <p>18 and someone we deposited.</p> <p>19 Mr. Dey appears to be more involved in</p> <p>20 the overall business of Datacore not specific to a</p> <p>21 particular product. Again, we're going off of limited</p> <p>22 information. We don't know what we don't know. We've</p> <p>23 received just under 1,500 documents total from</p> <p>24 Datacore in this matter in all of the discovery.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 39</p> <p>1 Loughmiller and Hank Hsieh.</p> <p>2 I'm not convinced that either or both</p> <p>3 of them has confirmed that there is a collection of</p> <p>4 documents somewhere relating to design and development</p> <p>5 that was missed or overlooked or not produced for</p> <p>6 whatever reason. I'm satisfied, as I said earlier,</p> <p>7 that everything relevant to design and development has</p> <p>8 been produced. And I think in my view it would be a</p> <p>9 fishing expedition for me to order Scale to go and</p> <p>10 look into the Salesforce database for anything more</p> <p>11 that may be relevant to design and development</p> <p>12 documents.</p> <p>13 So on this record, the request is</p> <p>14 denied without prejudice.</p> <p>15 Let's move on to the last issue, which</p> <p>16 is Scale's issue seeking replacement document</p> <p>17 custodians to search for ESI from Datacore. And I</p> <p>18 will hear Scale on that point.</p> <p>19 MS. GORDINA: And Your Honor, just so I</p> <p>20 know how to tailor my discussion, how much time do we</p> <p>21 have left? Do we really only have two minutes left or</p> <p>22 can we go past the hour mark?</p> <p>23 THE COURT: You can have a few more</p> <p>24 minutes. Really here, let me ask my questions.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 41</p> <p>1 So we could be slightly off when we</p> <p>2 identified Mr. Dey. Again, it was based on limited</p> <p>3 information. But we feel that the other four we've</p> <p>4 identified, their names have come up repeatedly as</p> <p>5 persons with knowledge, and we don't see Datacore</p> <p>6 really refuting that.</p> <p>7 But with respect to Mr. Dey, to be</p> <p>8 honest, we might have been off. Again, we're just</p> <p>9 going off of a very limited set of documents that</p> <p>10 we've received in discovery from Datacore.</p> <p>11 THE COURT: All right. So let me</p> <p>12 backtrack a little. You get these disclosures, these</p> <p>13 paragraph three A disclosures of custodians from</p> <p>14 Datacore, and that's roughly a little over a year ago</p> <p>15 in October of early October 2022.</p> <p>16 And it's my understanding that it</p> <p>17 doesn't become an issue that five of these custodians</p> <p>18 lacked any type of ESI. That doesn't become apparent</p> <p>19 to Scale until October of 2023 after, I guess,</p> <p>20 reviewing documents and seeing none from five that</p> <p>21 were on the original list. Is that correct?</p> <p>22 MS. GORDINA: That timeline is correct,</p> <p>23 Your Honor.</p> <p>24 THE COURT: And then some of them</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 42</p> <p>1 include inventors who have no ESI, is that correct?</p> <p>2 MS. GORDINA: The five individuals of</p> <p>3 the nine custodians for whom we've now just recently</p> <p>4 learned Datacore had no ESI, they are all inventors,</p> <p>5 correct.</p> <p>6 THE COURT: In fact, three of them have</p> <p>7 been originally identified in the paragraph three A</p> <p>8 disclosures have now been withdrawn. Scale is not</p> <p>9 going to even pursue depositions of them, is that</p> <p>10 correct?</p> <p>11 MS. GORDINA: Correct. For three of</p> <p>12 them, we agreed between the parties, stipulated that</p> <p>13 if Datacore agrees not to rely on them. Because these</p> <p>14 individuals are also listed on their initial</p> <p>15 disclosures, their rule 26 disclosures.</p> <p>16 So in exchange for Datacore agreeing</p> <p>17 not to bring those individuals to trial, we agreed not</p> <p>18 to take their depositions. We were attempting to</p> <p>19 streamline the issues to take only the important</p> <p>20 depositions. We've had I think 16 or 17 depositions</p> <p>21 just in this last month.</p> <p>22 THE COURT: Understood. And then with</p> <p>23 respect to Mr. Chen, his deposition, he is an</p> <p>24 inventor, he had no ESI. And his deposition was</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 44</p> <p>1 you know, as I said with regard to the other issues,</p> <p>2 these issues are always very case, fact intensive and</p> <p>3 case specific. Yeah, you can get up to 10. It</p> <p>4 doesn't mean that if you list 10, all of them are</p> <p>5 going to have relevant ESI to produce. There may be a</p> <p>6 smaller subset of them that have ESI.</p> <p>7 So if nine are listed or eight are</p> <p>8 listed or ten are listed, and it only turns out three</p> <p>9 or four of them have relevant ESI, where's the rule</p> <p>10 that says that triggers replacement custodians</p> <p>11 automatically?</p> <p>12 MS. GORDINA: No, Your Honor, there's a</p> <p>13 nuance there. Our argument isn't that you have to</p> <p>14 have 10 or you have to have 9. Our argument is we</p> <p>15 went through the entire course of fact discovery with</p> <p>16 the understanding that the search terms would be</p> <p>17 searched against the ESI of these custodians.</p> <p>18 It's one thing to think that you ran</p> <p>19 the search terms and there were no hits, there were no</p> <p>20 relevant documents. It's another thing to say there</p> <p>21 was nothing to search. Had they told us that there's</p> <p>22 nothing to search, we would have had our conversation.</p> <p>23 We would have had a meet and confer, an objective, and</p> <p>24 said, well, how about you add a few more people?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 43</p> <p>1 taken, as I understand it, on November 3rd, is that</p> <p>2 correct?</p> <p>3 MS. GORDINA: No. Mr. Chen has not</p> <p>4 been deposed. So I'll just rewind. I think it's</p> <p>5 beneficial to have some context here. So these</p> <p>6 inventors were listed as custodians for whom Datacore</p> <p>7 represented to us that Datacore had their ESI. They</p> <p>8 also --</p> <p>9 THE COURT: I understand, and I</p> <p>10 understand that Datacore never updated its disclosures</p> <p>11 to say, hey, you know, five of these folks don't have</p> <p>12 any ESI to produce. And it would have been nice</p> <p>13 before the close of fact discovery if that had been</p> <p>14 done, and that would have given Scale an opportunity</p> <p>15 to say, can we talk about replacing them with other</p> <p>16 custodians. But and again, you know, I'll talk to</p> <p>17 Datacore about the timeline of these.</p> <p>18 But what I'm losing and missing from</p> <p>19 Scale's argument is why a party who initially lists</p> <p>20 custodians who turn out later to have no ESI, what</p> <p>21 role or authority is there that requires that party to</p> <p>22 substitute others in their place?</p> <p>23 You know, although the discovery</p> <p>24 default standard gives each side up to 10 custodians,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 45</p> <p>1 It's not the case where Datacore is so</p> <p>2 small that they don't have more than three or four</p> <p>3 people who qualify as a custodian under the paragraph</p> <p>4 three disclosures. It's that they basically had</p> <p>5 filler names on their paragraph three disclosures,</p> <p>6 names of individuals for whom they couldn't have</p> <p>7 produced an ESI because now we know they have none.</p> <p>8 And they never told us.</p> <p>9 It was only after we pressed the issue</p> <p>10 and we said, it looks suspicious that you don't have</p> <p>11 any documents for these five custodians. They came</p> <p>12 back to us in mid-October and said, oh, we don't have</p> <p>13 any emails, we don't have any ESI.</p> <p>14 So they essentially deprived us of</p> <p>15 being able to get documents and ESI from custodians</p> <p>16 who would possibly, had they run ESI search numbers</p> <p>17 against those other custodians, they would have been</p> <p>18 able to produce some documents. I</p> <p>19 It's very alarming that Datacore has</p> <p>20 produced less than 1,500 documents in this case. And</p> <p>21 over 300 of those documents are printouts from Scale's</p> <p>22 website, and another 140-some are just slip sheets</p> <p>23 [ph].</p> <p>24 So they've produced about 1,000</p>

Page 46

1 documents, and it's becoming clear how they got there.
2 What they did wasn't in the spirit of the paragraph
3 three disclosures. Their approach to discovery here
4 is not in line with the spirit of what the default
5 standard asks the parties to do. And the parties here
6 agreed to abide by the default standard. We just,
7 now --
8 THE COURT: Yeah, we're not talking
9 about -- again, I will get into the compliance with
10 the default standard with Datacore. That's not what
11 the issue is about. And I understand it's, you know,
12 it's something that is very troubling to Scale that it
13 was handled that way.
14 But Scale's got to show a basis for the
15 relief it's seeking. And I started asking about these
16 witnesses. I'm still not convinced that this
17 individual, Dey, who is an executive officer of an
18 unrelated Datacore division, Perifery, is a custodian
19 who's likely to have relevant ESI. But let's move off
20 him.
21 You've got two 30(b)(6) depositions
22 coming up. Or you have a 30(b)(6) deposition coming
23 up with two witnesses, Zabrowski and Thimble. It's
24 clear in patent litigation that just because certain

Page 47

1 witnesses are designated as 30(b)(6) witnesses on
2 behalf of a company, it's not necessarily the case
3 that those are the witnesses who have also been
4 designated as ESI custodians and whose ESI has been
5 searched.
6 You know, again, there's no hard and
7 fast rule that noticing, designating certain witnesses
8 in response to a 30(b)(6) Deposition Notice
9 automatically triggers and makes them records
10 custodians for purposes of a search of their ESI. At
11 least I'm not aware of any. And I think the case law
12 that I found that's not cited in either side's brief
13 is to the contrary.
14 Are you aware of any case authorities
15 that designating a witness is a 30(b)(6) witness
16 automatically requires them to be designated as a
17 records custodian for ESI?
18 MS. GORDINA: No, Your Honor, and
19 that's not quite our argument. Mr. Zabrowski's
20 relevance goes beyond just the mere fact that he was
21 identified as a 30(b)(6) witness.
22 I'll give you a very clear example. At
23 his deposition, he testified that prior to his company
24 [REDACTED]

Page 48

1 [REDACTED]
2 [REDACTED]
3 [REDACTED] He couldn't recall
4 details. He couldn't recall who was involved in that
5 analysis, what the results were.
6 Had we had the opportunity to have
7 Datacore run ESI search terms against Mr. Zabrowski's
8 ESI and his emails, we very likely would have found
9 documents relating to that very issue, which is very
10 pertinent to the case. It's very much relevant to the
11 case.
12 So we did our best to identify five
13 replacement custodians who would have relevant
14 information. Again, we might have missed the mark
15 with Mr. Dey, but with respect to Zabrowski, Thimble,
16 it's not merely that they're 30(b)(6) witnesses.
17 Their testimony shows that they have information
18 relevant to the issues in the case. And where their
19 memory stops and they say I can't remember at the
20 deposition, that's where the documents would have been
21 helpful to us.
22 And I think that's the concern, is we
23 missed out on that discovery because Datacore listed
24 people that shouldn't have even been listed. We now

Page 49

1 have a declaration from a Mr. Thimble at Datacore
2 saying, oh, we delete documents. So Datacore and its
3 attorneys should have known last October that these
4 five individuals shouldn't even be listed on paragraph
5 three disclosures because there's nothing to search
6 for them.
7 THE COURT: Well, the search terms and
8 such were developed after they were designated,
9 correct?
10 MS. GORDINA: That's correct. Yes.
11 The parties went through the process of identifying
12 search terms after that.
13 THE COURT: How soon were the search
14 terms exchanged and document repositories of ESI, the
15 process for searching them began? Give me a timeframe
16 if you know. You may not know for Datacore, but at
17 least for Scale. When did that generally occur in the
18 litigation?
19 MS. GORDINA: Well, for Scale, we ran
20 the search terms after Your Honor resolved the
21 dispute. You'll recall Datacore wanted to add 19
22 search terms and the rules allow for 10. And after
23 Your Honor ruled that they could only add 10, then
24 there was a timeline in your order for when they were

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 50</p> <p>1 to give us those search terms. We ran the search 2 terms, and that's when we made our large email 3 production in mid-August before the close of fact 4 discovery. So we did it then. 5 We received most of Datacore's ESI 6 production in the last 10 days of discovery. 7 THE COURT: Got it. 8 MS. GORDINA: And over 90 percent of 9 their production was in the last two weeks of 10 discovery. 11 THE COURT: And just very briefly, for 12 these other two proposed replacement custodians, 13 Alexander Best and Amit Baranwal, what's their 14 significance and why do you think they're custodians 15 of relevant ESI? 16 MS. GORDINA: So with respect to 17 Mr. Baranwal, his name came up multiple times in 18 depositions as someone who would have knowledge. 19 Mr. Bassett for a number of questions said, I would 20 contact my boss, Mr. Baranwal, about that. So he was 21 identified because of his knowledge with respect to 22 specifically the SANsymphony. And the same for 23 Mr. Best. His name came up as somebody with knowledge 24 of the product.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 52</p> <p>1 anything further from Scale before I do? 2 MS. GORDINA: I don't believe so. I 3 would just again reiterate that we were really 4 surprised and caught off guard when we learned about 5 this just about a month ago in mid-October. It was 6 our understanding that the parties were in good faith 7 doing what paragraph three and ten -- 8 THE COURT: And I'm aware of the 9 circumstances. I'll get on that with Datacore. It's 10 been fully fleshed out in the briefing. And we've got 11 some limited time. My time is running -- 12 MS. GORDINA: Thank you, Your Honor. 13 Thank you. I'll stop there. 14 THE COURT: -- other matters. Thank 15 you. 16 Let me hear, Ms. Benassi, you know, 17 explain this to me as to how you designate all these 18 folks. And then, you know, well after fact discovery 19 closes, oh, well, we, you know, we just didn't realize 20 that five of them had nothing to produce. How does 21 that happen? 22 MS. BENASSI: Yeah, Your Honor, with 23 respect to Datacore's October 4, 2022, paragraph three 24 disclosures, Datacore identified its six named</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 51</p> <p>1 And the SANsymphony product is 2 important here because Datacore is making the claim 3 that they practice their product, that these products 4 compete with the accused product, and that that has 5 implications for lost profits and damages. 6 So Mr. Baranwal and Mr. Best both came 7 up. Their names came up in the testimony of other 8 witnesses who said these individuals would know 9 certain things about SANsymphony relating to both the 10 technical and the marketing business side of it. 11 THE COURT: Wouldn't searching the 12 emails of Best and Baranwal likely be cumulative, 13 particularly of Mr. Bassett if not others within 14 Datacore? 15 MS. GORDINA: No, because Mr. Bassett 16 is very much a pure engineer. He doesn't deal with 17 the marketing. He doesn't deal with the business side 18 of the sales for the product. So his documentation, 19 albeit very limited, we've received, you know, a very 20 small production of his documents, it's more focused 21 on the software and the technical side of things as 22 opposed to the business marketing side. 23 THE COURT: Okay. Anything further? I 24 have a question I want to ask the other side. But</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 53</p> <p>1 inventors of the patent issue because they are the 2 inventors and this is a patent case. When we looked 3 at the patent, we looked at these individuals and 4 thought these are the people that are most likely to 5 have information relating to the development of the 6 inventions disclosed in the patent. 7 The patent was filed in 2002, over 20 8 years ago, and almost no large company would maintain 9 ESI from that era. We identified these custodians on 10 our paragraph three disclosures because we thought, 11 okay, they might have information, they might be 12 relevant individuals to depose, they might recall 13 something. And we didn't know at the time if there 14 was going to be any other documents stored in any 15 other repository. 16 What Datacore did was it collected 17 documents from all locations where relevant 18 information might be found and it ran its search terms 19 on those documents. And that included collecting 20 documents from document repositories, shared sites, 21 OneDrive, the engineering databases. 22 This also included ESI from Nick 23 Connolly, who's the chief architect and co-founder of 24 Datacore, who's been identified by many fact</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 54</p> <p>1 witnesses, if not all, as the main developer of the 2 invention disclosed in the patent. There's literally 3 no other locations where information relating to the 4 asserted patent might be stored, and we've produced 5 all responsive documents. 6 So there may be documents that these 7 inventors wrote and put on a shared drive, and all of 8 those documents were searched for the inventor's 9 names, for the subject matter. Everything's been 10 produced. 11 With respect to the other point I 12 wanted to make, Datacore and Scale reached an 13 agreement in August at Scale's request that Scale 14 would not depose four of the six inventors if Datacore 15 agreed not to rely on them at trial. Now, we agreed 16 to three. We were on the fence about Chen. Chen has 17 since not been deposed in this case. So even back in 18 August, Scale decided to forego the depositions of 19 these inventors. 20 At no point until last month did Scale 21 seek to have the proposed custodians included in 22 Datacore's ESI disclosures, and discovery's been 23 closed for almost three months. With respect to -- 24 THE COURT: Yeah, but you know, you've</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 56</p> <p>1 Datacore, gee, we're not getting documents from these 2 others, we better update our list of paragraph three A 3 custodians? 4 MS. BENASSI: Well, there was no need 5 to update the custodial list. All of the documents 6 relating to the invention, the invention that's led to 7 the patent, have been produced. 8 And you know, with respect to the 9 proposed custodians that Scale listed in its letter, 10 none of those people have non-duplicative information 11 that's relevant to the claims and defenses in this 12 litigation. I mean, at issue -- 13 THE COURT: Yeah, you could argue that, 14 but there's no measuring stick to determine that. I 15 mean, not that I doubt your arguments. You're an 16 officer of the court and I accept your arguments. 17 But you know, Scale is in a position 18 now where all, you know, it was going forward with the 19 litigation at least since October of 2022 believing 20 that the custodians listed, all nine of them, had 21 discoverable ESI, and then it turns out that the 22 majority of them, five out of the nine, don't. And 23 didn't learn of that in time within the discovery 24 period to do anything about it. Only learned it by</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 55</p> <p>1 made the same arguments on your motion to compel on 2 behalf of Datacore against them about a document dump. 3 They're saying that most of these documents came in, 4 I'm not necessarily saying that Datacore dumped them 5 on them, but the majority if not all of the relevant 6 documents from Datacore were produced very close to 7 the eve of the close of fact discovery in August. Is 8 that not the case, they weren't produced in June, 9 July, and August? 10 MS. BENASSI: Your Honor, it goes back 11 to the nuance again. Scale's initial discovery 12 request related to the patent. And the documents we 13 produced back in May when we ran our search terms were 14 related to the patent. It wasn't until August 1st 15 that Scale served its second set of discovery requests 16 that sought information on SANsymphony, the product. 17 We produced all of those documents timely before the 18 close of fact discovery. 19 THE COURT: In producing them, it 20 didn't occur to you that, you know, at that point, you 21 still hadn't produced anything from five of the 22 custodians that you had made or put on your list a 23 year prior, or at least August of 2022? In all of 24 these productions, it's not occurring at all to</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 57</p> <p>1 going through the documents that were produced. 2 In any event, you know, I don't know 3 think that's going to solve the problem. But if you 4 have a response to that, I'll hear it. Because I do 5 have one important question that I want to make sure I 6 ask and hear your response before I make a ruling on 7 this and before I truly have to go in five minutes or 8 so. 9 MS. BENASSI: Yes, Your Honor. Thank 10 you. So Scale had notice of Datacore's paragraph 11 three custodian since October 2022, and they never 12 objected to the custodians that the CEO, the CFO, the 13 Vice President of Product Development, the Director of 14 Product Management, and the GM should be listed as 15 custodians. Not once. 16 The custodians that are on the 17 paragraph three disclosures are our inventors, and 18 those inventors would have information relating to the 19 patent. The proposed custodians do not have any 20 information relating to the asserted patent. 21 And with respect to the depositions of 22 Mr. Bassett and Nikolov, all of Datacore's witnesses 23 have provided fulsome, substantive responses. There 24 wasn't one question they couldn't ask.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 58</p> <p>1 And I'll also point again to a nuance 2 that counsel had just brought up with Mr. Baranwal. 3 She said his name came up multiple times in Bassett's 4 depo, but that's misleading, because they were asking 5 Mr. Bassett questions relating to what's Datacore's 6 policy related to document retention? He didn't know 7 what the policy was related to document retention. He 8 said he didn't know. And then they said, well, who 9 would you ask? And he said, I probably just ask my 10 boss, Mr. Baranwal. 11 So he answered all substantive 12 questions relating to SANsymphony. And with respect 13 to Mr. Best, I'll quickly just say that, I mean, he 14 was asked questions, who else knows the product? Who 15 else knows the product besides you? And so -- 16 THE COURT: That's fine. And I don't 17 doubt your representations about what was said in 18 deposition. But let me further tweak that argument 19 with you. 20 This dispute over adding these five 21 additional custodians has been fermenting so to speak 22 since early October. Within that time, from the time 23 this dispute, you know, arose and the parties 24 discussed it until now, end of November that we're</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 60</p> <p>1 MS. BENASSI: That's correct, Your 2 Honor. 3 THE COURT: All right. Anything 4 further before I hear brief rebuttal from Scale? 5 MS. BENASSI: I would just reiterate 6 that the information that they would seek from these 7 proposed custodians is duplicative of what has already 8 been produced. 9 With respect to the SANsymphony 10 product, Datacore identified its vice president of 11 software engineering, its director of engineering, and 12 its senior software engineer for all technical aspects 13 of SANsymphony. And Datacore search their ESI as well 14 as all, again, document repositories. And Scale has 15 deposed all of these witnesses. They provided 16 substantive fulsome responses. There's not been any 17 issues with any of their depositions. 18 And with respect to damages, Datacore 19 produced its annual financial statements, including 20 R&D costs, revenue costs, margins, units sold. And 21 Datacore further conceded to produce data on a monthly 22 basis and produce all of his audited financials going 23 back as far as it maintains that information. 24 One last note I would say is besides</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 59</p> <p>1 having this hearing, did Datacore at any time attempt 2 at a minimum to run a hit count on running the search 3 terms against the ESI of these custodians that Scale 4 is pushing for? So that the Court and Scale, all of 5 us, has some sense of how many hits are on those 6 search terms for each of these custodians. 7 And that is often very helpful to the 8 Court in resolving these types of issues, where hit 9 with a request to search the records of these new 10 custodians who had not been previously searched. 11 MS. BENASSI: Sorry, Your Honor, just 12 to make sure I understand what you're asking -- 13 THE COURT: Did you run a hit count in 14 each of these proposed five custodians? That's 15 Baranwal, Dey, Zabrowski, Thimble, using the search 16 terms that the parties agreed on that you ran against 17 the other original custodians? 18 MS. BENASSI: Okay. So you're asking 19 if we collected the emails for these proposed 20 custodians and ran the search terms on them? 21 THE COURT: Yes, if you ran hit counts. 22 MS. BENASSI: We have not, Your Honor. 23 THE COURT: The idea with the universe 24 that is no way to determine I guess, right?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 61</p> <p>1 our P27 [ph] and 28, which have been resolved before 2 this Court, there are no other RFPs that Scale has 3 asserted are at issue, has found any deficiencies with 4 in terms of Datacore's document production. 5 THE COURT: Very well. All right. 6 Final words from Scale, please. 7 MS. GORDINA: Thank you, Your Honor. 8 Thank you, Your Honor. Very briefly, I was listening 9 very carefully to Ms. Benassi's argument, and with all 10 due respect, I think it misses the point. The point 11 here isn't we want them to produce documents that have 12 been deleted from the inventors. We accept that these 13 documents don't exist. We accept that there's a 14 limited number of inventors and they don't have ESI 15 for them. So we're not saying let's find five people 16 who will have that information. We accept their 17 representation that it's gone. 18 What we're saying is they filled in 19 slots on their paragraph three disclosures with names 20 of people for whom they could not have produced 21 anything relevant. And that deprived us of discovery. 22 And had we known that, we could have had a 23 conversation about who else could have filled the 24 spot.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 62</p> <p>1 So it's not a, let's try to find people 2 who have information about the invention. That's with 3 the inventors and it's gone. We're saying as a whole, 4 looking at all the issues in the case, there are other 5 custodians at Datacore with information relevant to 6 the issues. 7 And we just simply did not get 8 discovery for them because of the way Datacore 9 approached this ESI disclosure and production 10 procedure. And it wasn't what we had understood. And 11 there was no way for us to know until we finally 12 pressed the issue and they told us about a month ago, 13 we don't have anything. 14 So that's really the issue. It's not a 15 one for one, let's find people who could fill the 16 shoes of the inventors. And that's what Ms. Benassi 17 was really focused on. That's not the point. As a 18 whole, there are other people at Datacore, other 19 custodians with information relevant to the case. And 20 the example I gave about [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] 23 The documents of those custodians would 24 have been really helpful. They would have been</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 64</p> <p>1 to its claims of infringement and/or damages claims is 2 just so jeopardized by this, you know, deficient 3 discovery, that it's worthwhile then to open the door 4 up to five additional custodians. 5 MS. GORDINA: Your Honor, I'll give you 6 a very clean example. One of the claims that Datacore 7 is making is that their products compete head to head 8 with the accused product of Scale and that they've 9 lost sales. They've lost profits. There's a void of 10 documents relating to that issue. We don't see 11 anything relating to the competition between the 12 companies, how it was tracked, whether sales were 13 lost. 14 Ther is absolutely -- I mean, their 15 production is woefully deficient. We don't see 16 evidence about how the products technically operate 17 and how they practice their own patent. We don't see 18 any information about how these companies allegedly go 19 head to head and how Datacore loses sales. And that's 20 a core piece of their damages argument in the case. 21 And that's just an area where we don't have anything. 22 And it's now becoming clear why we 23 don't have anything. It's because people who would 24 have had information related to that issue, their</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 63</p> <p>1 relevant and we were entitled to them. And we missed 2 out on that. And that's the problem here. It's not 3 resolved by just doing nothing, which is what I'm 4 hearing Datacore is proposing, let's do nothing. We 5 don't think that that's the remedy here. 6 THE COURT: Is anything missing that is 7 critical to the case that you haven't gotten to date 8 through discovery? Because let's face it, there could 9 always be one or two or three more custodians that a 10 party wishes you could add to the list. But that's 11 why the Court puts the brakes on a limit of 10 absent 12 good cause. 13 Because you could keep searching and 14 searching and searching, and arguably everyone 15 connected with the company at a particular time and 16 associated with a particular product line arguably has 17 relevant information. But you know, there has to be 18 some management of the scope and the volume of 19 discovery. 20 MS. GORDINA: Of course. 21 THE COURT: And unless there's 22 something on this record that demonstrates that 23 Datacore's production to date has been so woefully 24 inadequate that Scale's ability to prepare a defense</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 65</p> <p>1 documents simply weren't searched. And of course, 2 there's a limit. You can't search everything. That's 3 why the rule of limit to 10. 4 And our position isn't you must have 10 5 or you must have 9. There's no magic number. But 6 we're just saying that we missed out on relevant 7 discovery in this case because of the way Datacore 8 approached discovery under the default standard. We 9 don't think it was what the rules intend or what the 10 parties, you know, had agreed to early on in the case 11 when we said we'll follow this procedure. I'll stop 12 there. 13 THE COURT: Very well. 14 Anything -- well, I think I've heard enough argument. 15 On this record, I'm not satisfied that 16 there is a sufficient reasonable basis and/or good 17 cause to add five replacement custodians. Had Scale 18 been more targeted and focused in picking one or two 19 from these five and tying it in to the claims at issue 20 in this litigation and why a search far outside the 21 fact discovery deadline would be essential to Scale's 22 ability to litigate its defenses to Datacore's claim, 23 the Court may have been more inclined to find a 24 solution.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 66</p> <p>1 But on this record, it's very thin. It 2 hasn't been tethered to any of the claims or defenses 3 being litigated. That's not to say, however, that the 4 Court condones the way these custodians were 5 identified and handled. As I mentioned, with respect 6 to the document dump, there are better ways of 7 litigating that would decrease the likelihood of 8 having these types of discovery issues coming before 9 the Court. But we're here now and there's nothing we 10 can do to correct the past. I can only go by the 11 record that's made before me. 12 And while I may be hearing information 13 on this call that might weigh slightly in favor of 14 maybe selecting one or two of these custodians, it's 15 outside of the arguments that were briefed. And so 16 I'm hearing these arguments for the first time on this 17 call. I don't know that they've been vetted with the 18 other side. 19 I can't really tell that there's been a 20 meaningful meet and confer and an attempt to reach a 21 compromise resolution, or at least for Scale to ask 22 Datacore, hey, we think that, for example, 23 hypothetically, Mr. Baranwal, was mentioned so 24 frequently by Mr. Bassett, can you least collect his</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 68</p> <p>1 But I'm not saying I would grant it, 2 particularly at this stage in the litigation where it 3 is so advanced, and now the parties are on the eve of 4 expert discovery, which opens a completely different 5 phase of the case. 6 As the parties are aware, Judge 7 Williams indicated that he was keeping this case on 8 track for an August trial. He gave the parties some 9 flexibility to make some minor adjustments as needed 10 for witnesses and for the schedules of counsel. But 11 beyond that, this case is staying on track for an 12 August trial and the schedule will be maintained. 13 And that is paramount in the Court's 14 case management practices here. And also factors into 15 how I've resolved these disputes today, and how I may 16 view any future disputes that arise out of the 17 depositions yet to be taken and/or the expert 18 discovery phase. 19 So those are my rulings. I usually 20 allow the transcript to serve as the record of the 21 Court. And in this case, I will partially do that. 22 But I think it may be helpful to the parties to have a 23 written order as well simply memorializing the Court's 24 rulings and giving some basic rationale for each of</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 67</p> <p>1 ESI and run search terms against it so we would have a 2 sense of the universe of hit counts that come up when 3 you do that? 4 There's nothing in front of the Court. 5 I'm, you know, trying to resolve this issue in a 6 complete vacuum based on, you know, a history of, you 7 know, perhaps manners of litigating that could have 8 been better and alleviated this problem had better 9 steps been taken months ago to inform that the 10 custodians originally designated weren't all the most 11 apt custodians for this case. 12 But on this record, I deny the motion 13 to compel Datacore to collect, search, and produce ESI 14 from the five replacement custodians. 15 But again having said that, as these 16 depositions go forward, certainly there are 17 depositions yet to be taken. If these witnesses are 18 questioned about having and/or maintaining any 19 documents that may be supportive of or may highlight 20 or be background information for the deposition 21 testimony that they're giving, and it turns out that 22 the particular witness has never had their ESI 23 searched, you know, that may form a basis for coming 24 back.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 69</p> <p>1 them. And I will do that promptly as well. 2 With that, does the plaintiff have 3 anything further that the Court needs to address at 4 this time? 5 MS. BENASSI: No. Thank you, Your 6 Honor. 7 THE COURT: All right. Anything 8 further on behalf of the defendant Scale? 9 MS. GORDINA: Your Honor, I'll just 10 mention some of the discussion today regarding the 11 deposition testimony, for example of Mr. Zabrowski, 12 that deposition took place after we filed our motion. 13 So some of the information that I provided in my 14 argument today was not available. It did not exist at 15 the time we filed our motion. I just wanted to put 16 that on the record. 17 And then in addition, with respect to 18 the financial documents, I also just wanted to state 19 that we have not received them yet and don't have a 20 date certain for when we will receive them. But 21 assuming that Datacore will produce them in short 22 order, then that issue appears to be resolved. 23 THE COURT: I appreciate that. And I 24 know that things happen in real time, and that you</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 70</p> <p>1 don't often, you know, upon the writing of these 2 letter briefs have everything you need to inform the 3 Court, and I appreciate that clarification. 4 If there are any issues with respect to 5 the matters that had been resolved between the parties 6 and the Court did not have to rule on them, then you 7 can certainly come back to the Court if it's impacting 8 the expert discovery schedule, or any other -- or 9 causing any other concerns with respect to the 10 litigation. 11 And all of my rulings are without 12 prejudice. I recognize that discovery is not a static 13 thing and things may occur during the course of 14 discovery that would cause a party to raise an issue 15 that perhaps did not, you know, seemed as it was 16 resolved. 17 There may be subsequent discovery 18 issues that come up, that tie in with the issues that 19 I've addressed going forward in the litigation, and 20 each side is without prejudice to raise whatever 21 issues in the future it needs to with the Court as 22 appropriate. So let me be clear about that. 23 With that, I thank everyone for your 24 time and for your arguments and for accommodating my</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 72</p> <p>1 CERTIFICATE 2 I, ANDREW WEADER, the officer before whom 3 the foregoing proceedings were taken, do hereby 4 certify that any witness(es) in the foregoing 5 proceedings, prior to testifying, were duly sworn; 6 that the proceedings were recorded by me and 7 thereafter reduced to typewriting by a qualified 8 transcriptionist; that said digital audio recording of 9 said proceedings are a true and accurate record to the 10 best of my knowledge, skills, and ability; that I am 11 neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any 12 of the parties to the action in which this was taken; 13 and, further, that I am not a relative or employee of 14 any counsel or attorney employed by the parties 15 hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the 16 outcome of this action. 17 <i>Andrew Weader</i> 18 ANDREW WEADER 19 Notary Public in and for the 20 State of Pennsylvania 21 22 23 24</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 71</p> <p>1 schedule today. And we are concluded. I am 2 adjourning the conference call and disconnecting. 3 (Whereupon, at 1:38 p.m., the 4 proceeding was concluded.) 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 73</p> <p>1 CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER 2 I, DANIEL O'CONNELL-SANTOS, do hereby 3 certify that this transcript was prepared from the 4 digital audio recording of the foregoing proceeding, 5 that said transcript is a true and accurate record of 6 the proceedings to the best of my knowledge, skills, 7 and ability; that I am neither counsel for, related 8 to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action 9 in which this was taken; and, further, that I am not a 10 relative or employee of any counsel or attorney 11 employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or 12 otherwise interested in the outcome of this action. 13 14 <i>Daniel O'Connell Santos</i> 15 DANIEL O'CONNELL-SANTOS 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24</p>

[& - accommodating]

Page 1

&	2	302 3:9	628 2:9
& 2:5,13 3:4 5:15 6:3,22	20 53:7 2002 32:10	31 6:16 23:23 25:16 26:6	6322712 1:19 6th 3:6
1	33:13 53:7	31st 8:15	7
1 8:10,13	2012 32:9,11	323 2:16	70 18:13
1,000 45:24	33:13	3rd 43:1	8
1,500 40:23	2016 33:1 36:4	4	844 1:15
45:20	2022 41:15	4 52:23	9
10 9:4,12 18:11	52:23 55:23	415 2:6	9 44:14 65:5
21:19 36:12	56:19 57:11	424 2:17	90 18:10 50:8
43:24 44:3,4	2023 1:11 8:7	446-6900 2:17	90067 2:15
44:14 49:22,23	23:23 41:19	499 8:13	94105 2:7
50:6 63:11	210-2925 2:16	5	984-6000 3:9
65:3,4	22-535 1:7 5:4	5,000 12:20	99 7:5,17,23
12 7:3	25386 72:17	17:5,14 18:18	a
12:11 1:12	26 42:15	21:20	abhijit 40:3
1313 3:6	267,466 9:3	5,100 7:19 14:6	abide 46:6
137,172 9:3	26th 23:2	14:8,12 19:11	ability 11:4
13th 20:10,18	27 8:7	20:6 22:17	12:3 63:24
14 1:16	28 61:1	5,122 23:16	65:22 72:10
140 45:22	28529 73:14	5,127 8:15	73:7
151,074 8:9	28th 2:14	5600 2:6	able 14:7,10
15th 15:24	29 1:11	577-0107 2:9	20:24 22:8,18
16 42:20	3	6	22:19 28:18
17 42:20	30 7:10 8:2,17	6 7:10 8:2,17	33:15 45:15,18
18 7:21	9:13,19,22	9:13,19,22	absent 63:11
18th 8:22 10:19	10:11 11:11	10:11 11:11	absolutely
14:13 20:10,19	15:4 16:13	15:4 16:13	64:14
19 9:4 49:21	17:18 21:2,24	17:18 21:2,24	absorb 20:24
1900 2:14	25:11,19 46:21	25:11,19 46:21	accept 56:16
19801 1:17 3:7	46:22 47:1,8	46:22 47:1,8	61:12,13,16
1998 32:19	47:15,21 48:16	47:15,21 48:16	accommodati...
1:38 71:3	30,000 10:16,17	6100 1:16	70:24
1st 18:12 55:14	300 45:21		

[accomplished - asks]

Page 2

<p>accomplished 25:24</p> <p>accurate 72:9 73:5</p> <p>accused 26:22 29:17 32:10 33:3,12 37:4 40:8 51:4 64:8</p> <p>acquisition 47:24</p> <p>action 72:12,16 73:8,12</p> <p>actually 10:17 21:23 27:7 29:6 33:3</p> <p>add 44:24 49:21,23 63:10 65:17</p> <p>added 37:2,2,4 37:7</p> <p>adding 58:20</p> <p>addition 69:17</p> <p>additional 8:15 11:21 15:1 16:13 19:9 21:2 25:6 29:17 32:13 58:21 64:4</p> <p>address 34:3 69:3</p> <p>addressed 70:19</p> <p>adjourning 71:2</p>	<p>adjusted 13:6</p> <p>adjustments 9:16 10:2 68:9</p> <p>advance 15:20</p> <p>advanced 68:3</p> <p>advertisements 23:12</p> <p>afternoon 5:13 5:24 6:4 17:1</p> <p>ago 41:14 52:5 53:8 62:12 67:9</p> <p>agree 10:21</p> <p>agreed 32:19 42:12,17 46:6 54:15,15 59:16 65:10</p> <p>agreeing 42:16</p> <p>agreement 54:13</p> <p>agrees 42:13</p> <p>alarming 45:19</p> <p>albeit 8:22 51:19</p> <p>alexander 28:24 29:4,9 36:9,15 37:5 40:3 50:13</p> <p>allegedly 22:3 64:18</p> <p>alleviated 67:8</p> <p>allow 49:22 68:20</p> <p>alternative 10:21 21:5</p>	<p>amend 11:11</p> <p>amit 40:3 50:13</p> <p>amount 16:12</p> <p>analysis 13:17 48:2,3,5 62:21</p> <p>analyze 7:9 12:19 14:6 15:3 33:15 34:11</p> <p>analyzed 48:1</p> <p>analyzing 13:17</p> <p>anderson 3:4</p> <p>andrew 1:18 72:2,18</p> <p>angeles 2:15</p> <p>annual 60:19</p> <p>answer 20:16 20:21 23:9 36:19 37:12</p> <p>answered 58:11</p> <p>apparent 41:18</p> <p>apparently 26:16</p> <p>appear 23:11</p> <p>appearances 5:11</p> <p>appears 40:19 69:22</p> <p>appreciate 69:23 70:3</p> <p>approach 46:3</p> <p>approached 62:9 65:8</p>	<p>approaching 47:24</p> <p>appropriate 24:13 70:22</p> <p>apt 67:11</p> <p>architect 30:5 53:23</p> <p>area 64:21</p> <p>arguably 63:14 63:16</p> <p>argue 56:13</p> <p>argued 31:13</p> <p>argues 34:7</p> <p>argument 7:15 13:4 22:21,23 28:7 34:4 43:19 44:13,14 47:19 58:18 61:9 64:20 65:14 69:14</p> <p>arguments 5:7 6:4 12:12 55:1 56:15,16 66:15 66:16 70:24</p> <p>arose 58:23</p> <p>aside 5:5,8 33:6</p> <p>asked 10:19 17:10 21:23 23:2,7 28:10 31:1,7 32:7,18 36:5 58:14</p> <p>asking 46:15 58:4 59:12,18</p> <p>asks 46:5</p>
---	---	---	--

[aspects - bindu]

Page 3

aspects 60:12 asserted 54:4 57:20 61:3 assist 19:22 20:5 assistance 20:1 associated 63:16 assuming 16:14 69:21 attempt 59:1 66:20 attempting 13:20 42:18 attend 5:9 attended 29:1 attorney 72:14 73:10 attorneys 49:3 attributes 35:6 audio 72:8 73:4 audited 60:22 august 6:16 8:14 9:4,12 10:9 14:19 23:23 25:16 26:6 50:3 54:13,18 55:7 55:9,14,23 68:8,12 authorities 47:14 authority 43:21 automatically 13:15 44:11	47:9,16 available 69:14 avenue 2:14 aware 19:16 47:11,14 52:8 68:6 b b 4:1 7:10 8:2 8:17 9:13,19 9:22 10:11 11:11 15:4 16:13 17:18 21:2,24 25:11 25:19 46:21,22 47:1,8,15,21 48:16 back 11:11 15:7,9,9,14 23:4 25:5 29:4 29:18,22 32:7 33:1 36:1 38:4 38:21 45:12 54:17 55:10,13 60:23 67:24 70:7 background 67:20 backtrack 41:12 balance 26:1 balancing 19:4 baranwal 40:3 50:13,17,20 51:6,12 58:2 58:10 59:15	66:23 based 17:8 38:13,23 40:15 41:2 67:6 basic 68:24 basically 45:4 basis 19:21 20:4,9,18 23:15 38:3 46:14 60:22 65:16 67:23 bassett 40:16 50:19 51:13,15 57:22 58:5 66:24 bassett's 58:3 becoming 46:1 64:22 began 49:15 beginning 10:10 behalf 2:2,11 3:2 5:15 6:1 8:2 16:24 30:22 47:2 55:2 69:8 belated 7:18,24 25:7,15 belatedly 13:10 24:7 26:6 believe 21:21 31:3 32:3 37:6 52:2 believed 18:5 31:9	believing 56:19 benassi 2:3 5:17,17 6:21 6:22 8:5,20 9:1 9:15,21 10:8 11:14,20 12:5 12:18 14:3,15 15:19 16:7,16 16:20 18:9 22:1,7,14,15 26:20 28:8 29:6,15,21 30:23 32:5 33:11,23 37:15 37:16 38:8 52:16,22 55:10 56:4 57:9 59:11,18,22 60:1,5 62:16 69:5 benassi's 17:13 61:9 beneficial 43:5 best 40:3 48:12 50:13,23 51:6 51:12 58:13 72:10 73:6 better 56:2 66:6 67:8,8 beyond 33:9 38:21 47:20 68:11 biggest 9:2 bindu 3:3 6:1
--	--	---	---

[bit - come]

Page 4

bit 5:6 18:16 31:10 34:16 black 13:14 boggs 1:14 boss 50:20 58:10 bpalapura 3:8 brakes 63:11 break 30:7 brief 14:5 27:2 34:4 47:12 60:4 briefed 66:15 briefing 12:9 12:12,14 13:24 34:6 52:10 briefly 50:11 61:8 briefs 70:2 bring 42:17 brochure 35:14 brochures 35:22 brought 58:2 building 1:14 bulk 7:9 8:21 11:12 burden 20:4 24:3,9 business 40:20 48:2 51:10,17 51:22 busy 20:14 button 25:13	c c 2:1 3:1 5:1 c.a. 1:6 ca 2:7,15 caleb 1:14 calendar 5:10 call 9:10,10 24:5 38:20 40:6 66:13,17 71:2 calls 7:13 carefully 61:9 carried 24:2,9 case 7:1,6 10:24 11:3 13:12,22 24:8 24:8 25:2 26:8 26:23 28:3 29:5 32:9,10 33:12,20 40:3 44:2,3 45:1,20 47:2,11,14 48:10,11,18 53:2 54:17 55:8 62:4,19 63:7 64:20 65:7,10 67:11 68:5,7,11,14,21 cases 19:17 25:2 category 38:16 caught 52:4 cause 33:8,8,18 33:22 38:3,20 63:12 65:17	70:14 causing 70:9 ceo 57:12 certain 14:9 46:24 47:7 51:9 62:21 69:20 certainly 24:6 30:17 67:16 70:7 certificate 72:1 73:1 certify 72:4 73:3 cfo 57:12 chance 13:1 chen 42:23 43:3 54:16,16 chief 53:23 circumstances 52:9 cited 47:12 claim 51:2 65:22 claims 33:16 56:11 64:1,1,6 65:19 66:2 clarification 70:3 clarity 8:9 clean 64:6 clear 9:2 22:16 26:9 46:1,24 47:22 64:22 70:22	clearly 19:5 23:13 client 36:1 close 8:10,12 8:14,18 9:5,12 12:21 18:8,15 43:13 50:3 55:6,7,18 closed 23:4 54:23 closely 8:4 closes 52:19 closing 9:18 13:10 code 27:10 28:10,12,13,17 28:21 29:1,11 29:18,23 30:1 30:7,12 36:10 36:11,13,14,16 36:22 37:2,5,6 37:7 colleague 5:16 collect 66:24 67:13 collected 53:16 59:19 collecting 53:19 collection 31:21 32:1,4 39:3 come 15:7 41:4 67:2 70:7,18

[coming - court]

Page 5

coming 19:22 20:13 25:5 30:13 46:22,22 66:8 67:23 comment 22:8 committed 12:13 companies 48:1 64:12,18 company 47:2 47:23 53:8 63:15 company's 27:11 compel 6:12 23:21 26:11 38:11,21 55:1 67:13 compelling 26:18 compete 51:4 64:7 competition 64:11 complaining 37:21 complete 24:17 32:18 67:6 completely 7:2 68:4 completion 8:12 18:12 compliance 46:9	component 30:12 components 30:8 compromise 66:21 computer 29:3 29:18 36:12 computing 1:7 2:11 3:2 5:22 conceded 60:21 concern 48:22 concerns 70:9 concluded 5:9 36:16 71:1,4 conclusory 13:5 condense 5:7 condones 66:4 confer 23:2 44:23 66:20 conference 6:9 71:2 conferred 17:20 confidential 35:15 confirm 31:20 confirmed 39:3 connected 40:7 63:15 connolly 53:23 cont'd 3:1 contact 50:20	contemplating 21:9 contentions 33:16 37:4 contents 17:9 context 43:5 continue 38:23 contoured 25:6 contours 24:16 contradicted 22:2,4 contradiction 31:10 contradicts 17:16 contrary 47:13 conversation 44:22 61:23 convinced 39:2 46:16 copies 12:5,6 core 15:6 64:20 corporation 1:4 2:2 correct 8:19,20 9:1,14,15 10:8 10:23 11:13,14 11:20 12:4,7 12:11 14:15 16:16 30:23 41:21,22 42:1 42:5,10,11 43:2 49:9,10 60:1 66:10	corroon 3:4 costs 60:20,20 counsel 5:7,12 6:8 10:24 17:19 58:2 68:10 72:11,14 73:7,10 count 59:2,13 counts 59:21 67:2 couple 27:21 32:12 course 17:24 44:15 63:20 65:1 70:13 court 1:1 5:2,4 5:10,18,20 6:5 7:12 8:16,21 9:8,16 10:1 11:10,15,23 12:8 13:3,8 14:12 15:16 16:5,9,18,22 19:8,18 20:22 22:10,14 23:18 23:20 24:6,14 25:5,20 27:21 28:23 29:13,16 30:2 31:11 33:5,17 34:1 35:2 36:21 37:14,19 38:10 39:23 41:11,24 42:6,22 43:9 46:8 49:7,13
---	---	--	--

[court - deficiencies]

Page 6

50:7,11 51:11 51:23 52:8,14 54:24 55:19 56:13,16 58:16 59:4,8,13,21,23 60:3 61:2,5 63:6,11,21 65:13,23 66:4 66:9 67:4 68:21 69:3,7 69:23 70:3,6,7 70:21 court's 5:18 7:2 68:13,23 crawl 26:1 create 30:2 created 28:5 38:18 critical 63:7 cumulative 51:12 cure 13:20 current 12:16 currently 12:16 custodial 40:11 56:5 custodian 45:3 46:18 47:17 57:11 custodians 39:17 40:2 41:13,17 42:3 43:6,16,20,24 44:10,17 45:11 45:15,17 47:4	47:10 48:13 50:12,14 53:9 54:21 55:22 56:3,9,20 57:12,15,16,19 58:21 59:3,6 59:10,14,17,20 60:7 62:5,19 62:23 63:9 64:4 65:17 66:4,14 67:10 67:11,14 customer 34:20 34:21,22,22 35:15,15,21 37:22 cut 23:23 24:7 25:16 26:6 d d 5:1 40:6 damages 51:5 60:18 64:1,20 daniel 73:2,15 data 60:21 database 34:8 37:24 38:5 39:10 databases 53:21 datacore 1:4 2:2 5:3,12 6:18 6:19 7:7,8,11 8:3 11:9 12:19 12:23 14:5 17:6 18:10,12	18:19,22 19:5 19:21 21:8,17 22:12 24:2,8 24:17 25:9 26:4,17 28:5 30:22 32:18 33:15 34:7,8 36:2 37:9,21 38:17 39:17 40:20,24 41:5 41:10,14 42:4 42:13,16 43:6 43:7,10,17 45:1,19 46:10 46:18 48:1,7 48:23 49:1,2 49:16,21 51:2 51:14 52:9,24 53:16,24 54:12 54:14 55:2,4,6 56:1 59:1 60:10,13,18,21 62:5,8,18 63:4 64:6,19 65:7 66:22 67:13 69:21 datacore's 6:12 8:24 10:4,24 11:4 13:2 17:19 26:11 28:2 34:4,17 36:6 37:3 50:5 52:23 54:22 57:10,22 58:5 61:4 63:23	65:22 date 1:11 8:1,3 8:6 36:5 63:7 63:23 69:20 david 40:4 day 15:9 36:10 36:14 days 9:4,12 11:7 18:11 37:8 50:6 de 1:17 3:7 deadline 6:16 7:20 8:11 12:16 18:12 38:2 65:21 deadlines 7:4 deal 51:16,17 dealt 26:13 decided 54:18 declaration 49:1 decrease 66:7 default 32:13 32:16 33:5,10 33:19 38:22 43:24 46:4,6 46:10 65:8 defendant 1:8 2:11 3:2 4:7 6:2 69:8 defense 63:24 defenses 56:11 65:22 66:2 deficiencies 61:3
--	---	---	---

[deficient - discovery's]

Page 7

deficient 64:2 64:15	10:11,19,22 11:2,13,16,16	designer 27:18	disclosure 62:9
delaware 1:2 5:14	12:2 14:20,23 15:4,9,13	details 21:8 27:6 48:4	disclosures 40:17 41:12,13
delete 49:2	17:12 18:1	determine 56:14 59:24	42:8,15,15
deleted 61:12	42:9,18,20,20	determined 21:1	43:10 45:4,5
demonstrates 63:22	46:21 50:18 54:18 57:21	developed 24:16 49:8	46:3 49:5
demonstrating 24:9	60:17 67:16,17 68:17	developer 54:1	52:24 53:10
denied 39:14	deprived 45:14	developers 30:11	54:22 57:17
denies 23:20	61:21	development 26:12,19,21	61:19
deny 38:11 67:12	describing 31:19	27:2 28:4	disconnecting 71:2
depo 58:4	description 4:2 4:6 30:16	30:10,15 31:22	discoverable 56:21
depote 53:12 54:14	design 26:12,18 26:21 27:2,5	38:12,17 39:4	discovery 5:5
deposed 11:22 21:19 40:18	27:16 28:4	39:7,11 53:5	6:15 7:1,22
43:4 54:17	30:10,15 31:2	57:13	8:11,13,14,18
60:15	31:21 32:24	dey 40:3,6,14 40:19 41:2,7	9:5,13,18
deposition 7:10 8:2,7 9:13,19	33:14 34:16	46:17 48:15	12:21 13:10,11
11:6,12 14:24	35:1,4,16,24	59:15	14:19 18:8,11
15:11,12 16:3	38:12,17 39:4	different 7:15 29:7 68:4	18:15 23:4,23
16:5,13 17:18	39:7,11	difficult 7:13 17:21 19:14	24:7 26:24
19:1 21:2,12	designate 52:17	27:13	32:14,16 33:7
21:17 25:11	designated 47:1,4,16 49:8	digital 72:8 73:4	38:2,22 40:24
26:8 27:8,24	67:10	directly 34:5,12	41:10 43:13,23
31:1 42:23,24	designating 47:7,15	director 57:13 60:11	44:15 46:3
46:22 47:8,23	designed 32:8 32:11 33:2,4	disclosed 53:6 54:2	48:23 50:4,6
48:20 58:18	33:13		50:10 52:18
67:20 69:11,12			55:7,11,15,18
depositions 9:20,23 10:7			56:23 61:21
			62:8 63:8,19
			64:3 65:7,8,21
			66:8 68:4,18
			70:8,12,14,17
			discovery's 54:22

[discuss - engineer]

Page 8

discuss 13:8 17:17 30:6 discussed 58:24 discussion 9:11 18:14,16 19:21 39:20 69:10 disfavors 13:9 19:18 24:6 disposed 26:15 dispute 5:5 49:21 58:20,23 disputes 7:22 68:15,16 disrupt 25:24 district 1:1,2 division 46:18 docket 5:3 8:4 document 6:15 7:3,20,23 8:8 8:12 9:11 13:9 13:16 15:1 19:18,24 23:11 24:6 25:4,15 33:14 34:21 39:16 49:14 53:20 55:2 58:6,7 60:14 61:4 66:6 documentation 28:15 29:23 30:3 35:22 40:15 51:18 documented 34:24	documenting 30:10 documents 6:15 7:6,10,19 8:10,14,15,22 9:3,17 10:13 10:16 11:11 12:20,22 13:1 14:6,8,9,12,20 15:3,15,18 16:2,8 17:6,9 17:11,14,24 18:2,10,13,18 18:19,23 19:1 19:3,11 20:6 20:14 21:1,20 21:24 22:3,5 22:17,22 23:3 23:6,10,15,16 23:22 24:10,18 25:7,10 26:5 26:13,19,21,24 27:3,4,5,10,11 27:14,16,19 28:1,4,10,11,17 28:21,24 31:2 31:8,9,12,21 32:8,13,21,24 33:2,9 34:7,9 34:16 35:1,2,4 35:13,16,17,19 35:20,23 37:18 37:20,22,22 38:12,16,16,17 38:23 39:4,12	40:23 41:9,20 44:20 45:11,15 45:18,20,21 46:1 48:9,20 49:2 51:20 53:14,17,19,20 54:5,6,8 55:3,6 55:12,17 56:1 56:5 57:1 61:11,13 62:23 64:10 65:1 67:19 69:18 doing 21:3 52:7 63:3 domino 13:21 door 64:3 doubt 56:15 58:17 drive 54:7 drives 40:10 due 11:5,8 15:23 21:4 61:10 duly 72:5 dump 9:11 13:16 19:24 25:15 55:2 66:6 dumped 55:4 dumping 20:6 dumps 13:9 19:18 24:6 duplicative 56:10 60:7	e e 2:1,1 3:1,1 4:1 5:1,1 40:6 earlier 12:2 24:5 39:6 early 41:15 58:22 65:10 ease 20:4 easier 9:9 easy 40:6 effect 13:21 effort 25:3 eight 11:7 44:7 either 13:9 15:12 39:2 47:12 email 20:12 40:16 50:2 emails 18:20 45:13 48:8 51:12 59:19 emery 2:5 5:15 6:22 employed 72:11,14 73:8 73:11 employee 72:13 73:10 employees 48:1 encompassing 26:9 ends 25:13 26:7 34:22 engineer 27:3 51:16 60:12
---	--	---	--

[engineering - first]

Page 9

engineering 53:21 60:11,11 engineers 27:6 entire 44:15 entitled 63:1 envisioning 16:6 equated 9:3 era 53:9 es 72:4 esi 35:11 39:17 41:18 42:1,4 42:24 43:7,12 43:20 44:5,6,9 44:17 45:7,13 45:15,16 46:19 47:4,4,10,17 48:7,8 49:14 50:5,15 53:9 53:22 54:22 56:21 59:3 60:13 61:14 62:9 67:1,13 67:22 esquire 2:3,4 2:12 3:3 essential 65:21 essentially 11:15 19:24 31:12 45:14 ethan 2:4 5:14 evd 4:2,6 eve 9:18 13:10 24:6 55:7 68:3	event 57:2 everything's 54:9 evidence 64:16 exactly 13:19 36:22 example 28:12 35:14 47:22 62:20 64:6 66:22 69:11 except 11:17 12:3 19:10 excerpts 38:24 exchange 42:16 exchanged 49:14 excluding 19:2 executive 46:17 exist 25:13 30:3 30:15,21 31:24 35:16 38:18 61:13 69:14 existence 28:1 31:18 exists 31:14 36:8 expect 5:9 expedition 39:9 expeditiously 24:22 expert 11:5,7 11:23 12:14 16:6 21:3,12 21:14 27:1 28:13 29:4,18	68:4,17 70:8 expert's 11:4 experts 12:6 13:2 34:11 explain 52:17 explains 16:10 extent 12:22 28:23 35:13 extreme 19:2 23:21 24:1,10 f face 63:8 facing 35:21 37:22 fact 8:11,12,14 8:18 9:5,12,18 9:20 11:13,16 11:21 12:21,24 18:8,11,15 20:6 22:2,4 23:3 24:11 32:3 38:2 42:6 43:13 44:2,15 47:20 50:3 52:18 53:24 55:7,18 65:21 factors 6:18 13:14 19:4 24:1,3 68:14 failed 18:9 faith 52:6 fallon 1:13 far 60:23 65:20 fast 47:7	faulting 24:20 favor 6:19 24:1 24:4 66:13 fc 34:10 federal 1:14 feel 12:10 41:3 feels 25:10 fence 54:16 fermenting 58:21 ferret 29:19 filed 32:10 33:13 53:7 69:12,15 fill 62:15 filled 61:18,23 filler 45:5 final 11:18 22:11 37:3 61:6 finally 62:11 financial 60:19 69:18 financially 72:15 73:11 financials 32:19 60:22 find 8:4 23:24 27:13 28:24 61:15 62:1,15 65:23 finding 19:14 fine 58:16 first 5:12 7:8 17:19 21:7
--	---	---	---

[first - grant]

Page 10

22:16,22 23:1 29:9 37:3 40:1 40:5 66:16 fishing 39:9 five 41:17,20 42:2 43:11 45:11 48:12 49:4 52:20 55:21 56:22 57:7 58:20 59:14 61:15 64:4 65:17,19 67:14 fleet 29:14 34:10 37:1,2,6 fleshed 52:10 flexibility 68:9 floor 2:14 3:6 30:18 focus 18:17 focused 17:3 51:20 62:17 65:18 folks 43:11 52:18 follow 65:11 forcing 38:4 forego 54:18 foregoing 72:3 72:4 73:4 form 6:14 12:15 21:5 28:2 30:20 67:23	formally 31:15 format 30:20 forward 6:7,10 6:11 10:11 11:19 13:23 56:18 67:16 70:19 found 27:2 35:9 38:19 47:12 48:8 53:18 61:3 founder 53:23 four 41:3 44:9 45:2 54:14 francisco 2:7 5:17 free 12:10 25:12 26:7 frequently 66:24 friday 11:5 front 67:4 full 14:19 fully 15:3 20:24 33:15 52:10 fulsome 57:23 60:16 function 35:3 functions 27:7 further 11:3 16:19 22:11 26:4 32:2 33:21 37:15 38:6,8 51:23 52:1 58:18	60:4,21 69:3,8 72:13 73:9 future 68:16 70:21 g g 5:1 gathered 38:14 gbw 1:7 gee 56:1 generally 26:7 30:20 49:17 getting 14:20 15:4 20:15 24:21 25:4 56:1 give 20:1 23:8 47:22 49:15 50:1 64:5 given 15:21 16:20 24:23 36:7 43:14 gives 43:24 giving 19:21 67:21 68:24 gm 57:14 go 6:7,10,11 11:11 12:3 15:14 16:1 29:18,22 38:4 38:21 39:9,22 57:7 64:18 66:10 67:16 goes 47:20 55:10	going 6:4 9:19 11:18 13:21,23 19:23 20:4 25:18 38:10 40:21 41:9 42:9 44:5 53:14 56:18 57:1,3 60:22 70:19 good 5:13,24 17:1 33:7,8,18 33:22 38:3,20 52:6 63:12 65:16 goodrich 2:13 6:3 gordina 2:12 6:2,3 16:23 17:1 20:8 21:6 22:13 34:14 35:10 37:1 39:19 40:14 41:22 42:2,11 43:3 44:12 47:18 49:10,19 50:8,16 51:15 52:2,12 61:7 63:20 64:5 69:9 gotten 21:18 63:7 grant 24:15 25:20 26:2 68:1
--	---	---	--

[guard - individuals]

Page 11

guard 52:4 guess 7:20 19:13 26:13 27:23 30:4 31:14 35:7 40:9 41:19 59:24	30:18 34:2 39:18 52:16 57:4,6 60:4 heard 65:14 hearing 1:10 7:15 15:20 21:7 22:1 30:16 59:1 63:4 66:12,16 helpful 21:2 48:21 59:7 62:24 68:22 hercules 3:5 hereto 72:15 73:11 hey 43:11 66:22 high 23:11 highlight 35:5 67:19 hindered 12:14 history 67:6 hit 15:8 34:5 59:2,8,13,21 67:2 hits 44:19 59:5 honest 41:8 honor 5:14 6:1 6:21,24 8:5 9:21 11:21 12:18 15:19 16:17 17:2,3 19:6 20:8 21:6 22:13,15 26:20 29:15 30:24	32:6 33:11,24 34:14 36:20 38:9 39:19 40:14 41:23 44:12 47:18 49:20,23 52:12 52:22 55:10 57:9 59:11,22 60:2 61:7,8 64:5 69:6,9 honorable 1:13 hope 24:22 hoping 21:17 36:7 hour 5:8 39:22 hours 25:22 hsieh 27:15 30:5 39:1 hsieh's 31:1,20 hundred 18:18 hypercore 29:14 34:10 hypothetically 66:23	identifying 49:11 ignored 7:2 illustrative 62:22 imagine 21:15 impacting 70:7 impacts 21:13 implausible 22:24 implications 51:5 important 17:23 33:14 42:19 51:2 57:5 importantly 22:21 35:7 inadequate 63:24 inadvertently 18:3,7 inclined 65:23 include 42:1 included 53:19 53:22 54:21 including 60:19 indicated 24:11 68:7 individual 40:7 40:11 46:17 individually 30:7 individuals 42:2,14,17
h	30:16 59:1 63:4 66:12,16 helpful 21:2 48:21 59:7 62:24 68:22 hercules 3:5 hereto 72:15 73:11 hey 43:11 66:22 high 23:11 highlight 35:5 67:19 hindered 12:14 history 67:6 hit 15:8 34:5 59:2,8,13,21 67:2 hits 44:19 59:5 honest 41:8 honor 5:14 6:1 6:21,24 8:5 9:21 11:21 12:18 15:19 16:17 17:2,3 19:6 20:8 21:6 22:13,15 26:20 29:15 30:24	h	identifying 49:11 ignored 7:2 illustrative 62:22 imagine 21:15 impacting 70:7 impacts 21:13 implausible 22:24 implications 51:5 important 17:23 33:14 42:19 51:2 57:5 importantly 22:21 35:7 inadequate 63:24 inadvertently 18:3,7 inclined 65:23 include 42:1 included 53:19 53:22 54:21 including 60:19 indicated 24:11 68:7 individual 40:7 40:11 46:17 individually 30:7 individuals 42:2,14,17
h	h	i	identifying 49:11 ignored 7:2 illustrative 62:22 imagine 21:15 impacting 70:7 impacts 21:13 implausible 22:24 implications 51:5 important 17:23 33:14 42:19 51:2 57:5 importantly 22:21 35:7 inadequate 63:24 inadvertently 18:3,7 inclined 65:23 include 42:1 included 53:19 53:22 54:21 including 60:19 indicated 24:11 68:7 individual 40:7 40:11 46:17 individually 30:7 individuals 42:2,14,17

[individuals - late]

Page 12

45:6 49:4 51:8 53:3,12 industry 23:12 inform 27:3 67:9 70:2 information 22:7 23:5,7 28:14 40:11,22 41:3 48:14,17 53:5,11,18 54:3 55:16 56:10 57:18,20 60:6,23 61:16 62:2,5,19 63:17 64:18,24 66:12 67:20 69:13 infringement 33:15 34:12 37:3 64:1 initial 42:14 55:11 initially 43:19 inopportune 19:24 20:7 inquiry 16:15 inspected 28:16 intelligently 22:8 intend 65:9 intensive 44:2 interactions 34:21 interest 19:7	interested 72:15 73:12 interim 15:17 20:23 24:12,15 interrupt 7:12 introduce 5:23 invention 54:2 56:6,6 62:2 inventions 53:6 inventor 42:24 inventor's 54:8 inventors 42:1 42:4 43:6 53:1 53:2 54:7,14 54:19 57:17,18 61:12,14 62:3 62:16 investigation 32:24 involved 40:19 48:4 issue 16:19 17:4,20 22:12 23:20 26:13,16 26:21 29:8 34:2 37:10 39:15,16 40:9 40:10 41:17 45:9 46:11 48:9 53:1 56:12 61:3 62:12,14 64:10 64:24 65:19 67:5 69:22 70:14	issued 8:17 9:14 issues 6:8,11 12:19 16:2 23:19 42:19 44:1,2 48:18 59:8 60:17 62:4,6 66:8 70:4,18,18,21 j j 1:14 january 15:24 jbenassi 2:8 jeopardized 64:2 job 1:19 jodi 2:3 5:17 6:22 judge 68:6 july 8:7,17 55:9 june 8:10,13 18:12 55:8 k keep 31:1 63:13 keeping 68:7 kevin 40:4 key 17:3 kind 28:2 31:16 king 1:15 know 5:22 7:13 7:19 10:15 12:22 13:8 15:21,21,22 16:7,8 19:13	24:12,22 25:13 25:14,21 27:16 27:19 30:4,11 31:3,5,15,23 32:23 35:3,8 39:20 40:22,22 43:11,16,23 44:1 45:7 46:11 47:6 49:16,16 51:8 51:19 52:16,18 52:19 53:13 54:24 55:20 56:8,17,18 57:2,2 58:6,8 58:23 62:11 63:17 64:2 65:10 66:17 67:5,6,7,23 69:24 70:1,15 knowing 21:16 knowledge 41:5 50:18,21 50:23 72:10 73:6 known 49:3 61:22 knows 58:14,15 l lacked 41:18 laptop 37:7 large 19:23 23:3 50:2 53:8 late 5:6 7:24 19:12 20:3
--	--	--	---

[law - matters]

Page 13

law 47:11 lead 10:24 leaning 31:24 learn 56:23 learned 42:4 52:4 56:24 led 56:6 left 15:6 39:21 39:21 legal 10:4 length 25:22 letter 12:9,12 12:14 13:24 14:5 21:23 22:23 27:1 34:6 56:9 70:2 level 23:11 light 9:17 20:6 likelihood 66:7 likely 37:20 46:19 48:8 51:12 53:4 limit 33:19 63:11 65:2,3 limitation 32:6 33:19 38:22 limited 9:9 33:1 36:4 40:21 41:2,9 51:19 52:11 61:14 limiting 32:14 limits 32:16 line 5:16,21,23 12:12 46:4 63:16	lingers 26:16 list 41:21 44:4 55:22 56:2,5 63:10 listed 40:1 42:14 43:6 44:7,8,8 48:23 48:24 49:4 56:9,20 57:14 listening 61:8 lists 43:19 literally 54:2 litigate 65:22 litigated 66:3 litigating 66:7 67:7 litigation 15:18 19:15,17 20:7 24:24 25:1,3 29:8 36:12 46:24 49:18 56:12,19 65:20 68:2 70:10,19 little 8:17 18:16 36:15,17 38:2 41:12,14 llp 2:5 3:4 locate 28:18 located 27:20 location 1:14 locations 53:17 54:3 look 8:4 18:4 21:16 23:5 29:19 31:23	38:23 39:10 looked 23:10 29:4 32:7 38:14 53:2,3 looking 13:13 30:14,21 32:24 36:10 40:11 62:4 looks 45:10 loose 25:13 26:7 los 2:15 loses 64:19 losing 43:18 lost 51:5 64:9,9 64:13 loughmiller 27:9 28:9,20 30:4 39:1 loughmiller's 27:24	maintaining 67:18 maintains 60:23 majority 55:5 56:22 make 7:14 10:1 31:17 36:19 37:23 54:12 57:5,6 59:12 68:9 makes 47:9 making 13:4 20:14 33:8 51:2 64:7 management 57:14 63:18 68:14 manager 29:14 34:10 37:1,2,7 manners 67:7 manuals 35:22 margins 60:20 mark 39:22 48:14 marked 4:4,8 market 3:6 marketing 37:23 51:10,17 51:22 materials 6:6 matter 5:3 11:1 40:24 54:9 matters 5:10 10:5 24:23
		m	
		machine 28:18 29:11 made 7:3 9:17 13:9 20:17 22:23 34:4 38:20 50:2 55:1,22 66:11 magic 65:5 main 27:18 35:3 54:1 maintain 53:8 maintained 27:12 68:12	

[matters - nuances]

Page 14

52:14 70:5 mcdermott 2:5 5:15 6:22 mean 13:4 14:9 19:14 31:14 44:4 56:12,15 58:13 64:14 meaningful 28:16 29:24 66:20 measuring 56:14 meet 23:1 44:23 66:20 memorializing 68:23 memory 12:13 48:19 mention 18:9 69:10 mentioned 8:3 21:22 66:5,23 mere 47:20 merely 48:16 merger 47:24 met 17:20 mid 24:20 45:12 50:3 52:5 middle 14:22 21:12 minimum 59:2 minor 68:9 minutes 39:21 39:24 57:7	misinterpreting 27:23 misleading 58:4 missed 39:5 48:14,23 63:1 65:6 misses 61:10 missing 14:1 29:2 36:23 43:18 63:6 mission 2:6 mistaken 14:14 misunderstan... 34:17 mitigating 13:20 moment 14:3 month 8:18 10:7,23 12:2 14:18 15:10 21:19 42:21 52:5 54:20 62:12 monthly 60:21 months 10:4 14:14 17:7,15 18:23 54:23 67:9 motion 6:12,13 23:21 26:11 37:10 38:11 55:1 67:12 69:12,15	move 10:21 23:19 26:10 39:15 46:19 moving 10:10 multiple 37:17 50:17 58:3 mwe.com 2:8 n n 2:1 3:1 5:1 name 30:5 50:17,23 58:3 named 52:24 names 41:4 45:5,6 51:7 54:9 61:19 nature 24:24 25:3 near 9:6 neatly 30:14 necessarily 47:2 55:4 necessity 25:11 need 5:7 13:19 16:10 21:21 23:19 32:21 33:18 34:12 38:2 56:4 70:2 needed 11:17 16:12 25:5,23 29:22 34:11 68:9 needs 18:17 24:17 35:5 69:3 70:21	neither 72:11 73:7 never 29:4 30:1 36:11,13 43:10 45:8 57:11 67:22 new 59:9 nice 43:12 nick 53:22 nikolov 57:22 nine 42:3 44:7 56:20,22 non 25:2 56:10 north 1:15 3:6 notary 72:19 note 60:24 noted 32:13 notice 7:11 8:2 8:7,17 9:14 11:12 20:17 47:8 57:10 noticing 47:7 notification 20:11 notifying 20:12 november 1:11 7:21 10:2,22 11:3,9,13 15:8 15:8,10 17:12 43:1 58:24 nuance 10:9 44:13 55:11 58:1 nuances 14:16
---	--	---	---

[number - people]

Page 15

number 5:3 50:19 61:14 65:5 numbers 45:16 numerous 36:2	onedrive 53:21 open 64:3 opening 12:15 opens 68:4 operate 64:16 operates 35:21 operating 6:24 operation 35:22 opportunities 34:19 opportunity 7:9 14:6 17:2 43:14 48:6 opposed 51:22 opposition 21:22 oral 26:15 order 7:4 12:17 26:15 39:9 49:24 68:23 69:22 original 41:21 59:17 originally 42:7 67:10 outcome 72:16 73:12 outlines 14:24 outside 65:20 66:15 overall 40:20 overlooked 12:10 31:22 39:5	own 7:1 17:8 64:17	19:15 23:1 42:12 46:5,5 49:11 52:6 58:23 59:16 65:10 68:3,6,8 68:22 70:5 72:12,14 73:8 73:11 party 33:7 43:19,21 63:10 70:14 pass 25:12 past 7:3 31:5 32:14,16,21 39:22 66:10 patent 26:22 32:9,10 33:12 33:13,20 36:12 46:24 53:1,2,3 53:6,7 54:2,4 55:12,14 56:7 57:19,20 64:17 pennsylvania 72:20 pennypack 6:18 13:14 19:4 23:24 24:3 people 34:19 44:24 45:3 48:24 53:4 56:10 61:15,20 62:1,15,18 64:23
o		p	
o 5:1 o'connell 73:2 73:15 objected 57:12 objective 44:23 occur 49:17 55:20 70:13 occurred 9:4 18:14 occurring 55:24 october 10:24 15:6 23:2 41:15,15,19 45:12 49:3 52:5,23 56:19 57:11 58:22 offerings 34:23 office 5:15 29:9 officer 46:17 56:16 72:2 oh 45:12 49:2 52:19 okay 6:5 8:16 23:18 27:21 29:16 51:23 53:11 59:18 once 19:20 20:23 57:15		p 2:1,1 3:1,1 5:1 p.c. 2:13 p.m. 1:12 71:3 p27 61:1 packaged 30:14 pages 9:3 palapura 3:3 5:22,24 6:1 papers 26:15 35:23 paragraph 40:17 41:13 42:7 45:3,5 46:2 49:4 52:7 52:23 53:10 56:2 57:10,17 61:19 paramount 68:13 part 13:16 27:1 30:12 34:17 40:9,9 partially 68:21 particular 36:4 40:21 63:15,16 67:22 particularly 51:13 68:2 parties 10:1,10 13:6 18:20	

[percent - produced]

Page 16

percent 7:5,17 7:23 18:10 50:8	32:3,6,15 33:21 36:9 38:1,6 39:18	preface 13:7	privilege 18:2
perform 28:15	54:11,20 55:20	prejudice 13:5	23:7,15
perifery 46:18	58:1 61:10,10	13:17,17,20,21	privileged
period 18:11	62:17	14:4,11 17:4	19:13 22:22
56:24	points 27:22	17:22 18:22	23:13,17
permission	policy 58:6,7	19:5 26:4	privy 35:15
5:19	portion 8:23,23	38:11 39:14	probably 58:9
person 27:17	position 16:14	70:12,20	problem 21:11
27:19 30:9	21:4 24:15	prejudiced	25:15,15 57:3
persons 41:5	56:17 65:4	11:4,9 12:23	63:2 67:8
persuade 38:7	possession 17:6	prejudices 13:2	procedure
pertinent 48:10	possible 16:4	preoccupied	62:10 65:11
ph 26:1 45:23	35:12 38:5	10:6	proceeding
61:1	possibly 45:16	prepare 63:24	11:12 71:4
phase 68:5,18	potential 34:19	prepared 6:7	73:4
picking 65:18	34:21 47:24	17:17 73:3	proceedings
piece 29:7	potentially	preparing	72:3,5,6,9 73:6
64:20	16:3 35:18	14:22,23,24	process 30:11
pieces 29:7,10	potter 3:4 6:1	15:13 17:24	49:11,15
place 43:22	potteranderso...	presenting 5:18	produce 18:5
69:12	3:8	president 57:13	23:3,6 27:13
plaintiff 1:5 2:2	practically	60:10	31:17 32:19,21
4:3 5:12,16	15:10	press 23:12	36:6 43:12
6:23 24:21	practice 51:3	24:23	44:5 45:18
69:2	64:17	pressed 45:9	52:20 60:21,22
plan 30:7	practices 68:14	62:12	61:11 67:13
platform 34:10	precisely 7:14	presume 12:11	69:21
plaza 3:5	precluding	previously	produced 6:15
please 12:10	6:14 15:17	21:14 22:16	7:6,19 8:9,13
34:13 61:6	23:21 24:10	26:14 59:10	8:15 9:18
plus 17:15	preclusion	printouts 45:21	10:16 12:20
point 10:9,21	13:16	prior 6:9 7:22	18:7,10,13
25:20 30:24		8:13 18:15	19:12,12,19,20
		47:23 55:23	19:20 23:22
		72:5	25:7 27:5

[produced - received]

Page 17

28:15 32:4,12 35:19,23 36:5 37:20 38:15 39:5,8 45:7,20 45:24 54:4,10 55:6,8,13,17,21 56:7 57:1 60:8 60:19 61:20 producing 12:15 20:2,3,3 55:19 product 27:18 29:17 32:8 34:23 35:21 37:5 40:8,13 40:21 50:24 51:1,3,4,18 55:16 57:13,14 58:14,15 60:10 63:16 64:8 production 7:18,20,24,24 8:9 9:2,5 20:16 20:17 25:5,8 26:12,18 35:20 38:11 50:3,6,9 51:20 61:4 62:9 63:23 64:15 productions 7:3,5,8 8:10 10:14 15:1 20:9 55:24 products 26:22 32:11 33:3,12	51:3 64:7,16 profits 51:5 64:9 promptly 69:1 pronounce 30:5 properties 35:5 propose 21:3 proposed 50:12 54:21 56:9 57:19 59:14,19 60:7 proposing 63:4 provide 8:6 20:16 23:9 27:6 36:7 provided 8:6 26:23 57:23 60:15 69:13 public 72:19 publications 23:12 purchasing 34:23 pure 51:16 purposes 9:11 47:10 pursue 42:9 push 10:2,6 pushed 10:3 pushing 59:4 put 29:3,12,13 29:16 54:7 55:22 69:15	puts 63:11 q qualified 72:7 qualify 45:3 question 16:11 20:21 21:21 22:19 40:5 51:24 57:5,24 questioned 18:24 22:4 67:18 questioning 21:10 questions 14:8 17:11 19:7 21:23 27:22 36:20 37:12 39:24 50:19 58:5,12,14 quickly 10:13 58:13 quite 47:19 r r 2:1 3:1 5:1 r&d 60:20 raise 70:14,20 raised 17:19 ramped 14:19 ran 44:18 49:19 50:1 53:18 55:13 59:16,20,21 range 25:24	rather 19:23 rationale 68:24 reach 66:20 reached 54:12 read 6:6 7:16 reading 27:24 ready 14:20 15:4 20:15 26:10 real 69:24 realize 52:19 realized 18:3 20:13 23:5 really 11:9 18:17 23:9 34:5 37:10,11 39:21,24 41:6 52:3 62:14,17 62:24 66:19 reason 31:13 33:6 39:6 reasonable 38:3 65:16 reasons 10:3 22:24 rebuttal 15:22 15:23 16:4,6 17:18 21:3 60:4 recall 48:3,4 49:21 53:12 receive 69:20 received 40:23 41:10 50:5 51:19 69:19
--	--	---	--

[recently - response]

Page 18

recently 42:3	39:4 48:9 51:9	63:5	request 28:2
recognize	53:5 54:3 56:6	remember	36:2 39:13
24:20 70:12	57:18,20 58:5	31:11 48:19	40:10 54:13
record 14:1	58:12 64:10,11	remembered	55:12 59:9
17:5,16 22:2	relative 72:13	31:8	requested 26:3
22:16 24:2	73:10	remembering	requests 55:15
25:19 38:20	release 26:3	62:20	requirement
39:13 63:22	releases 23:13	remembers	27:10 28:9
65:15 66:1,11	relevance	31:12	requires 43:21
67:12 68:20	47:20	repeatedly	47:16
69:16 72:9	relevant 26:12	28:10 36:5	reside 34:7
73:5	26:18 38:12	41:4	resolution
recorded 72:6	39:7,11 44:5,9	replacement	66:21
recording 72:8	44:20 46:19	39:16 40:2	resolve 67:5
73:4	48:10,13,18	44:10 48:13	resolved 6:9,11
records 47:9,17	50:15 53:12,17	50:12 65:17	49:20 61:1
59:9	55:5 56:11	67:14	63:3 68:15
reduced 72:7	61:21 62:5,19	replacing 43:15	69:22 70:5,16
referred 27:17	63:1,17 65:6	report 12:15	resolving 59:8
reflects 17:5	relief 6:14,19	16:4,6 17:18	respect 8:8
refused 10:20	16:13 20:23	reported 1:18	34:14 41:7
refuting 41:6	21:5 23:21	reports 11:5,8	42:23 48:15
regard 44:1	24:1,4,10 25:6	15:23,23 21:3	50:16,21 52:23
regarding	25:14,16 26:4	21:12,14	54:11,23 56:8
69:10	46:15	repositories	57:21 58:12
rein 26:7	rely 42:13	49:14 53:20	60:9,18 61:10
reiterate 52:3	54:15	60:14	66:5 69:17
60:5	relying 6:14	repository	70:4,9
related 16:12	23:22	34:15,24 53:15	respond 16:14
25:2 31:2 34:9	remainder	representation	28:7
55:12,14 58:6	15:18	17:13 61:17	response 7:16
58:7 64:24	remedies 24:8	representations	31:2,13 34:12
72:11 73:7	remedy 15:17	17:8 58:17	38:13 47:8
relating 26:22	17:21 22:7	represented 7:5	57:4,6
28:2 31:21	24:12,15 36:24	43:7	

[responses - scope]

Page 19

responses 57:23 60:16	29:15,21 33:23 34:1 37:14	35:13,17 37:18 39:10	39:18 40:2 41:19 42:8
responsive 34:6 34:7,9 38:15 54:5	38:10 41:11 59:24 60:3 61:5 69:7	salesperson 35:14	43:14 46:12 47:24 48:2,2,3 49:17,19 52:1
rest 13:22 16:21	role 43:21	san 2:7 5:17	54:12,13,18,20
result 13:15,15	rolling 19:20 20:4,9,17	sanction 19:2	55:15 56:9,17 57:10 59:3,4
results 48:5	room 1:16	sansymphony 40:8,12 50:22 51:1,9 55:16	60:4,14 61:2,6
retention 58:6 58:7	rosati 2:13 6:3	58:12 60:9,13	62:21 64:8
returned 36:11	roughly 8:17 41:14	santos 73:2,15	65:17 66:21 69:8
revenue 60:20	rule 42:15 44:9 47:7 65:3 70:6	satisfied 38:13 39:6 65:15	scale's 7:9 8:8 9:22 10:11
review 7:9 13:1 14:20 15:14 20:24 22:18,20 24:17 28:13,16 29:1,24 32:23 36:14,23	ruled 7:22 49:23	saw 40:15	14:7 21:4 25:12 27:10 28:16 32:17 34:8,23 38:13 39:16 43:19 45:21 46:14 54:13 55:11 63:24 65:21
reviewed 17:10 17:14 18:23 22:3,17 37:5,6	rules 7:3 49:22 65:9	saying 13:7 25:19 26:2,3 49:2 55:3,4 61:15,18 62:3 65:6 68:1	schedule 7:2 13:23 21:13 26:1 68:12 70:8 71:1
reviewer 36:13	ruling 57:6	says 28:3 44:10	scheduled 9:23
reviewers 18:4	rulings 68:19 68:24 70:11	scale 1:7 2:11 3:2 5:3,21 6:2 6:14,24 7:11 7:16 10:19 12:21 13:8 16:19,24 21:19 22:23 23:2,4 23:14,22 27:4 27:13,22,22 28:3,6,15,17 29:2 30:4,16 31:13,17 32:7 33:1 34:2,3 36:23 37:17 38:4,21 39:9	schedules 68:10
reviewing 11:10 20:14 41:20	run 35:11 45:16 48:7 59:2,13 67:1		scheduling 7:4 12:17
rewind 43:4	running 52:11 59:2		scientific 30:17
rfps 61:2	s		scope 16:11 25:21 63:18
right 5:2 8:24 9:20,21 10:7 11:19,23 15:23 16:9,18 18:5 20:22 22:10,14 23:18 27:19	sales 2:1 3:1 4:1 5:1 34:15,18 34:19 35:10 37:23 51:18 64:9,12,19		
	salesforce 27:12 34:8,15 34:18 35:5,11		

[scrambling - sort]

Page 20

scrambling 9:24	seeking 6:20 16:13 22:8	sheets 45:22	single 15:9
scribe 27:18 29:13 31:2 34:9	39:16 40:2 46:15	sherry 1:13	sites 53:20
search 33:9 35:11,11 38:4 39:17 44:16,19 44:21,22 45:16 47:10 48:7 49:5,7,12,13,20 49:22 50:1,1 53:18 55:13 59:2,6,9,15,20 60:13 65:2,20 67:1,13	seeks 28:5 38:18	shield 32:17	six 32:14,17,21 33:9,19 38:21 52:24 54:14
searched 35:7,9 44:17 47:5 54:8 59:10 65:1 67:23	seemed 17:9 70:15	shoes 62:16	size 9:6
searching 49:15 51:11 63:13,14,14	seems 18:15 40:7	short 15:17 36:18 37:12 69:21	skills 72:10 73:6
second 7:11 10:19 22:21 23:10 55:15	seen 28:22 31:7 36:13 40:1	shortage 35:20	slightly 7:19 41:1 66:13
see 8:3 12:13 13:19 17:21 18:21 19:3,6 33:2 34:5 41:5 64:10,15,17	selecting 66:14	shortly 13:10	slip 45:22
seeing 41:20	sends 35:14	shot 26:8	slots 61:19
seek 25:6,11,18 26:4 54:21 60:6	senior 30:5 60:12	show 14:1 46:14	slip 45:22
	sense 37:23 59:5 67:2	showing 13:4,6 24:3 38:3	small 45:2 51:20
	september 7:21 8:22 9:6,23 10:10,12,18 14:13,18,21 15:5 20:10,10 24:20	shown 13:18	smaller 44:6
	serve 68:20	shows 17:16 48:17	software 1:4 2:2 27:4,7 28:16 29:7,8 29:10,17 35:6 51:21 60:11,12
	served 7:10 8:2 21:14 55:15	side 35:24 43:24 51:10,17 51:21,22,24 66:18 70:20	sold 60:20
	set 5:4,8 12:16 32:18 33:6 41:9 55:15	side's 47:12	solution 65:24
	several 27:10	signature 72:17 73:14	solve 57:3
	severely 12:23	significance 50:14	somebody 31:22 50:23
	shape 12:15	significant 8:23	sonsini 2:13 6:3
	shared 53:20 54:7	similar 19:18 26:13	soon 18:6 20:13 49:13
		simplistically 30:20	sophisticated 30:17
		simply 26:23 36:8 62:7 65:1 68:23	sorry 7:13 59:11
			sort 21:12 28:4 38:17

[sought - telling]

Page 21

sought 55:16	stated 23:4,14	subset 44:6	system 34:10
source 28:12,13	27:1	substantial	t
28:17 29:1,10	statements	6:19 8:12	t 4:1
29:18,23,24	60:19	18:12	tailor 39:20
36:11,13,22	states 1:1	substantive	tailored 25:14
speak 58:21	static 70:12	57:23 58:11	25:17
specific 12:9	stating 28:21	60:16	take 16:3 42:18
24:8 26:5 30:9	staying 68:11	substitute	42:19
40:20 44:3	steps 67:9	43:22	taken 11:15,17
specifically	stick 56:14	sufficient 26:24	12:2,4 43:1
6:17 21:16	stipulated	28:14 65:16	67:9,17 68:17
25:6 34:3,9	42:12	suggested	72:3,12 73:9
40:16 50:22	stop 9:8 19:6	20:23	talin 2:12 6:2
speculating	20:20 36:19	suite 2:6	talk 43:15,16
35:8	37:11 52:13	summary 23:24	talking 34:20
spend 36:13	65:11	supplemented	46:8
spent 36:10,16	stopped 29:12	36:11,22	talks 31:5,8,12
spirit 46:2,4	stops 48:19	supportive	tangential
spot 61:24	store 37:23	67:19	18:16
spread 25:1,1	stored 37:18	supports 32:3	targeted 65:18
srf 1:7	53:14 54:4	sure 7:14,16	task 19:23
stage 68:2	story 7:15	8:5 19:16	tasked 30:10
standard 32:14	streamline	20:15 28:8	team 10:5
32:16 33:5,8	42:19	30:18 31:17	14:19,21 15:6
33:10,17,19	street 1:15 2:6	35:12 36:6,19	19:16 30:6
38:22 43:24	3:6	57:5 59:12	teams 25:1
46:5,6,10 65:8	structured	surprised 52:4	technical 48:3
stars 2:14	29:24	surprising	51:10,21 60:12
start 5:7,11	subject 54:9	17:15 36:15	technically
6:13 34:20	submitted 6:7	surrounds 40:9	35:12 64:16
started 46:15	subsequent	suspicious	teleconference
state 32:20	10:14 70:17	45:10	5:5,8 26:14
37:16 69:18	subsequently	sword 32:17	tell 20:5 66:19
72:20	29:3	sworn 72:5	telling 7:18,23

[temporal - triggers]

Page 22

temporal 32:6	theoretically	49:5 52:7,23	69:10,14 71:1
ten 44:8 52:7	11:24	53:10 54:16,23	today's 6:9
term 35:11	theory 35:22	56:2 57:11,17	15:20
terms 13:5,22	ther 64:14	61:19 63:9	told 28:17
13:22 14:4,16	thimble 40:4	tie 26:7 70:18	44:21 45:8
14:17 20:2,11	46:23 48:15	time 1:12 5:4	62:12
20:20,22 21:9	49:1 59:15	9:9,13,22 10:4	tomorrow 11:7
38:4 44:16,19	thin 25:1,1 66:1	12:1,19 15:2,3	11:19,22 12:4
48:7 49:7,12	thing 18:5 32:5	15:8,14 16:1	took 69:12
49:14,20,22	44:18,20 70:13	16:12,21 17:19	tool 34:15,18
50:1,2 53:18	things 31:14	19:7,9,16,24	topic 26:11
55:13 59:3,6	51:9,21 62:21	20:7 21:7 22:9	topics 16:11
59:16,20 61:4	69:24 70:13	22:22 25:14,23	25:22
67:1	think 6:8,8	29:10 32:8	total 7:6 40:23
testified 27:9	14:4 15:21	33:2 36:17,18	towards 31:24
27:11,15 30:6	16:1,2,10	37:3,6,13	townsend 2:4
37:17 47:23	18:17 21:11	39:20 52:11,11	5:13,14
testify 28:9	27:12 31:23	53:13 56:23	track 34:19
testifying 72:5	34:16 36:7	58:22,22 59:1	68:8,11
testimony 28:1	37:9,10 39:8	63:15 66:16	tracked 64:12
31:10,20 48:17	42:20 43:4	69:4,15,24	transcriber
51:7 67:21	44:18 47:11	70:24	73:1
69:11	48:22 50:14	timeframe	transcript
tethered 26:5	57:3 61:10	11:17 16:12	68:20 73:3,5
66:2	63:5 65:9,14	49:15	transcriptionist
thank 5:20 6:5	66:22 68:22	timeline 7:1	72:8
6:21 8:16	third 23:14	41:22 43:17	transcripts
16:22 17:2	thought 15:16	49:24	11:24 12:6
19:8 22:10,15	15:20 19:13	timely 55:17	38:24
23:17 26:20	53:4,10	times 36:2	trial 11:1 15:7
34:1 36:21	three 22:24	50:17 58:3	42:17 54:15
37:14 52:12,13	29:7,10 40:17	timing 14:16,17	68:8,12
52:14 57:9	41:13 42:6,7	tips 6:18	trials 10:5
61:7,8 69:5	42:11 44:8	today 5:18 6:2	triggers 44:10
70:23	45:2,4,5 46:3	22:1 68:15	47:9

[troubling - withheld]

Page 23

troubling 46:12	36:14,16 40:1	utilized 24:11	66:4
true 72:9 73:5	43:1,9,10	v	ways 66:6
truly 33:1 57:7	46:11 59:12	v 1:6	we've 15:13
try 62:1	understanding	vacuum 67:6	28:10 32:19
trying 29:19	7:14 10:3	vendor 20:15	35:19,23 36:1
67:5	20:12 29:2	vetted 66:17	36:5 40:22
turn 12:24 15:2	30:19,22 41:16	vice 57:13	41:3,10 42:3
43:20	44:16 52:6	60:10	42:20 51:19
turns 44:8	understood	videoconfere...	52:10 54:4
56:21 67:21	18:6 37:19	1:10 2:3,4,12	weader 1:18
tweak 58:18	42:22 62:10	3:3	72:2,18
two 6:8 10:4,14	unfortunately	view 8:24 39:8	website 45:22
14:14,24 15:24	22:6	68:16	wednesday
17:7,15,15	unit 1:16	void 64:9	1:11
18:8,23 20:9	united 1:1	volume 23:3	week 15:22,24
29:17 39:21	units 60:20	63:18	weeks 18:8
46:21,23 50:9	universe 59:23	vs 5:3	50:9
50:12 63:9	67:2	w	weigh 24:1,3
65:18 66:14	unrelated 10:5	want 7:14 8:1	66:13
tying 65:19	18:16 46:18	32:15 36:19	weighing 6:18
type 37:19	untimely 7:8,24	51:24 57:5	went 15:7 23:4
41:18	8:23	61:11	28:13 29:4,9
types 35:17,19	update 56:2,5	wanted 20:21	33:1 44:15
59:8 66:8	updated 43:10	49:21 54:12	49:11
typewriting	upend 21:13	69:15,18	white 13:14
72:7	upending 13:22	wants 33:7	35:23
u	use 15:17	34:8	williams 68:7
unable 7:11	used 34:18	warning 10:15	wilmington
unclear 21:20	useful 9:19	warranted 19:4	1:17 3:7
under 40:23	user 37:22,22	24:11	wilson 2:13 6:3
45:3 65:8	users 27:5	way 12:15	wishes 63:10
understand	using 32:17	13:11 40:8	withdrawn
14:13 17:23	59:15	46:13 59:24	42:8
19:14 27:4	usually 68:19	62:8,11 65:7	withheld 18:2,3
29:23 30:6			18:7 23:15

[withholding - zero]

Page 24

withholding	wrote 54:7
36:1	x
witness 9:20	x 4:1
11:21 25:19,23	y
40:17 47:15,15	y 40:6
47:21 67:22	yeah 13:3
72:4	23:17 29:21
witnesses 10:20	44:3 46:8
12:1 14:8,23	52:22 54:24
15:13 17:11	56:13
18:1,24 21:9	year 33:19
21:19,21,24	38:21 41:14
22:5,19 25:12	55:23
27:11 37:17	years 32:14,17
38:24 46:16,23	32:22 33:9
47:1,1,3,7	36:12 53:8
48:16 51:8	z
54:1 57:22	zabrowski 40:4
60:15 67:17	46:23 48:15
68:10	59:15 62:20
woefully 63:23	69:11
64:15	zabrowski's
words 22:11	47:19 48:7
25:9 61:6	zero 15:14
working 10:12	
worthwhile	
64:3	
wound 14:21	
wrapping 9:17	
write 11:4	
writers 30:11	
30:12	
writing 70:1	
written 27:5,6	
68:23	